

INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
A Xerox Education Company

72-18,097

RELYEA, Harold C., 1944-

ANTI-EXTREMISM AND IDEOLOGY: A STUDY OF
MEMBERSHIP ATTITUDES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF
THE INSTITUTE FOR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY, A NON-
PARTISAN, NON-SECTARIAN, ANTI-EXTREMIST
ORGANIZATION.

The American University, Ph.D., 1971
Political Science, general

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1972

HAROLD C. RELYEA

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

ANTI-EXTREMISM AND IDEOLOGY: A STUDY OF
MEMBERSHIP ATTITUDES AND CHARACTERISTICS
OF THE INSTITUTE FOR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY,
A NON-PARTISAN, NON-SECTARIAN,
ANTI-EXTREMIST ORGANIZATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy:
Government

Harold C. Relyea
December, 1971

Accepted:

Jerome J. Hanna
Dean

Date: October 7, 1971

Martin Meadows
Committee Chairman

Jerome J. Hanna

William A. Lybrand (m.m.)

R. A. [Signature]

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

FEB 7 1972

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ANTI - EXTREMISM AND IDEOLOGY: A STUDY OF
MEMBERSHIP ATTITUDES AND CHARACTERISTICS
OF THE INSTITUTE FOR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY,
A NON-PARTISAN, NON-SECTARIAN,
ANTI-EXTREMIST ORGANIZATION

ABSTRACT

Replicating, in part, an earlier study by Harry Scoble on the National Committee for an Effective Congress, this research focuses upon another interest group in American politics which, like NCEC, provides a means for the individual to extend his nonvoting political activities and to unite with anonymous but relevant others in a common cause. The Institute for American Democracy, a non-partisan, non-sectarian, anti-extremist organization, bases its activities on the defense of American democracy against the threatening behavior of the ideological fringes of the ultra left and the ultra right. This study examines, by a survey of Institute members, the attitudes and characteristics of these individuals with a view toward ascertaining their agreement with Institute ideology. These members evidenced an above average degree of political participation, rejected anti-democratic means to preserve democratic practices endangered by extremists, and held social-psychological attitudes and religious-racial backgrounds which were in harmony with the non-partisan, non-sectarian, anti-extremist position of the Institute. As suggested by Scoble's research, an attempt was also made to refute the classical Marxist view of ideology as a dependent variable determined by class. While IAD members were found to be in harmony with the Institute's ideology, they did not hold any particular common demographic characteristics, whether age,

education, or class (income level). It was generally concluded that the operations and activities of organizations like NCEC and IAD necessitate some new formulation of the concept of an interest group and that future research in this area should focus upon the relationship of ideology and group interest.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. PRO-DEMOCRATIC GROUPS IN AMERICA.....	1
Defending Democracy.....	2
Perception of Democracy.....	3
Social Movement to Formal Organization.....	9
The Sectarian Bias.....	12
Group Politics and Ideology.....	15
Biases and the Group Approach.....	15
Refining the Group Approach.....	18
Ideology and the Group Approach.....	21
Non-Sectarian Ideological Groups.....	28
Ideology and the Institute for American Democracy.....	31
II. METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH.....	34
Continuity and Discovery.....	36
Expertise and Enemies.....	37
Political Participation Considered.....	40
Social Characteristics Considered.....	47
Attitudes Considered.....	49
Ideological Cohesion Considered.....	53
Comparison and Evaluation.....	54
Nature of Comparisons.....	55
Attitudes and Extremism.....	58

CHAPTER	PAGE
Recognizing "Zealousy".....	63
Selecting the Institute for American Democracy.....	64
Questionnaire Structure.....	66
Attitude Scores.....	68
Sample and Response.....	69
Problematics.....	72
III. CHARACTERISTICS AND ATTITUDES OF ANTI- EXTREMISTS.....	78
General Characteristics of IAD Members.....	78
Identifying Bias.....	79
Identifying Extremism.....	84
Demographic Characteristics.....	86
Incidence of First Generation Americans.....	88
Sexual Identification.....	91
Religious Identification.....	91
Age Identification.....	97
Educational Identification.....	98
Occupational Identification.....	102
Income Identification.....	105
Political Activities.....	114
Political Partisanship.....	114
Political Participation.....	117



CHAPTER	PAGE
Social Characteristics and Sectarianism.....	120
Racial Sectarianism.....	121
Religious Sectarianism.....	125
Political and Social Attitudes of IAD Members.....	127
Incidence of Misanthropy.....	129
Incidence of Dogmatism.....	130
Incidence of Authoritarianism.....	131
Incidence of "Zealousy".....	132
Ideology and Class.....	134
VI. CONCLUSIONS.....	138
Implications for Interest Group Theory.....	143
Implications for Democracy.....	146
The Future of the Anti-Extremist Organization.....	149
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	154
APPENDIX I.....	165
APPENDIX II.....	224

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Membership Perception of IAD's Anti-Extremism Emphasis.....	79
II. Membership Perception of Homefront Bias.....	80
III. Lines of Print on Left-Wing and Right-Wing Activity as Reported in <u>Homefront</u>	81
IV. Rating of Other Political Groups by IAD Members...	83
V. <u>Homefront</u> Compared by IAD Members with Other Information Sources.....	84
VI. Extremism Defined by IAD Members.....	85
VII. Comparison of IAD Members and Left/Right Ideologues by Parental Birthplace.....	90
VIII. Comparison of IAD Members and Left/Right Ideologues by Sex Identification.....	90
IX. Comparison of IAD Members, New York Republicans and Rightists by Religious Preference.....	90
X. Ideological Orientation of Americans by Religion: Measured by Statements of Philosophic Principle..	93
XI. Ideological Orientation of Americans by Religion: Measured by Statements of Public Policy.....	93

TABLE	PAGE
XII. Ideological Orientation of Americans by Religion: Measured by Statements of Philosophic Principle and Public Policy Compared.....	93
XIII. Comparison of IAD and Religious Principles by Institute Members.....	94
XIV. Comparison of IAD Members, New York Republicans, and Rightists by Age Distributions.....	99
XV. Comparison of IAD Members and Left/Right Ideologues by Education.....	101
XVI. Comparison of IAD and Union Goals by Institute Members.....	104
XVII. IAD Members and Rightists Compared by Occupation..	106
XVIII. IAD Members and Communists Compared by Occupation.....	106
XIX. Average Annual Institute Contribution by IAD Members..	107
XX. Annual Income of IAD Members, New York Republicans, and Rightists Compared.....	108
XXI. IAD Contribution Relative to Other Political Contributions for the Same Period.....	109
XXII. Number of Groups Supported by IAD Members.....	109
XXIII. IAD Contributors to Interlocking Organizations.....	111
XXIV. IAD Members of Interlocking Organizations.....	111

TABLE	PAGE
XXV. Annual Contribution to a Party Organization by IAD Members.....	112
XXVI. Annual Contribution to a Candidate by IAD Members..	113
XXVII. Self-Evaluated Voting Trend for Last Ten Years by IAD Members.....	115
XXVIII. Self-Selected Partisan Label of IAD Members.....	116
XXIX. Hierarchy of Political Involvement by IAD Members..	118
XXX. Most Important Current Problem Perceived by IAD Members.....	122
XXXI. Force Used Against Chicago Demonstrators as Viewed by IAD Members and a National Sample of Americans.....	124
XXXII. Advice to Student on Agreeing Whether or Not to Engage in Campus Protest Activity.....	125
XXXIII. Incidence of Misanthropy Among IAD Members.....	129
XXXIV. Incidence of Dogmatism Among IAD Members.....	130
XXXV. Incidence of Authoritarianism Among IAD Members...	131
XXXVI. Incidence of "Zealousy" Among IAD Members.....	133
XXXVII. Correlation of Income Level and Education Level of IAD Members with Age Level Held Constant.....	136

PREFACE

In the aftermath of the New Deal and World War II a number of organizations appeared in American politics proclaiming programs of liberalism or conservatism. While united in ideological conviction, such groups have significantly differed from one another, regardless of their common beliefs, in the matter of strategy and tactics for obtaining their goals. Indeed, as one moves along the spectrum from the midpoint to the fringes, conservatism transforms into far right and ultra right thinking. Liberalism becomes socialism and, ultimately, communism when extended to the extremes. It was Walter Lippmann who, during one of his annual "conversations" over the Columbia Broadcasting System during the 1960's, noted that when the arms of the ideological spectrum are extended in a semicircle one finds, at the point where they meet, a form of totalitarianism which is composed of elements drawn from both sides of the belief scale. For Lippmann, German National Socialism constituted a type of eclectic extremism which could be found at this point of ideological union.

In America, the threats posed by such fringe elements were felt most acutely during the years of the Great Depression and world war. While minority groups had felt the sting of persecution at the hands of nativists and xenophobes, it was with the appearance of the

multi-colored shirt organizations and the fellow traveler causes that large segments of the American citizenry sought to collectively combat the extremists' advance. Out of this was born the non-partisan, non-sectarian, anti-extremist organization, an entity which has persisted in American politics from those times to the present.

This study is an examination of the people who become involved in such groups and the cause of anti-extremism. With slight reference to the tradition from which it springs, the focus of this research is primarily upon the operations and membership of the Institute for American Democracy. In addition, one finds here as well a profile of a new and emerging entity in American politics, a vehicle for political activity apart from traditional partisan electoral behavior. It stands as one of the numerous efforts by the public to not only become more influential in the democratic process but, in this case, to preserve and protect it as well.

Research of this type incurs many debts. Certainly the project would not have been possible without the complete cooperation of the Institute for American Democracy. This willingness to assist was never qualified by any requests for special access to research findings. No member of the Institute's leadership or staff ever expressed any fears regarding the conclusions which this study might posit. Not only does this testify to their faith in the abilities of the author, his supervisory committee, and the procedures of the research, but it points up

as well their positive belief in the principles and operations of the Institute and the type of supporter it enjoys. No words of gratitude will ever adequately acknowledge the assistance they provided.

A special note of appreciation must also be extended to those Institute members who, when confronted with a laborious twenty-two page questionnaire, bravely went ahead with the task. Tolerating questions which probably seemed contradictory and at times both simple and ridiculous, they too gave generously of their time and patience, providing personal information which they were assured would never be seen by anyone other than this author. Their confidence was not betrayed but their trust and willingness to cooperate is a testimony to the faith they have in the country and its citizens. Understanding the nature of the study, they expressed no hostility or fears regarding the use of their responses.

The original planning and development of this research took place under the guidance of Dr. Jeff Fishel who left The American University last year to join the faculty at San Francisco State College. Much is owed to him, nevertheless, for his help in shaping the design and providing the questionnaire model. I am also indebted to Dr. Harry Scoble whose study of the National Committee for an Effective Congress served as a theoretical and operational guide at many points during the preparation of this study and whose questionnaire was invaluable as a data gathering instrument. With slight modification, this questionnaire was

totally adopted for this survey. The author extends his thanks to both of these men.

In addition to those already mentioned, a number of organizations and individuals provided information and assistance in this research and are herewith acknowledged. As on other occasions, the offices of Group Research, Inc., proved to be a source of valuable and continuous information. Their holdings include not only material on the multiplicity of right-wing organizations of the last twenty years but many fugitive and otherwise rare documents and publications by earlier anti-extremist organizations. Second, a note of gratitude and appreciation must be extended to Maurer, Fleisher, Zon and Associates, Inc., for background material on the Southern Committee on Political Ethics. Mr. Frank W. Wright of the Freedom Institute was equally generous in providing source information on that organization.

Much valuable information resulted from an afternoon conversation with Mr. Kenneth Birkhead, one-time executive director of the Friends of Democracy and the son of that organization's founder and leader. His recollections and the comments of Mr. Wesley McCune on the history of the anti-extremist cause were both insightful and informative. Their views were much appreciated.

No project of this type ever comes to completion without the careful scrutiny and evaluation of one's dissertation committee advisors. These faculty members gave freely of their time and were most under-

standing when differences of opinion resulted between their views and those of the author. They are gratefully acknowledged for their guidance.

Financial assistance was provided during the course of this research through a National Science Foundation Traineeship awarded for the Summer of 1970, an American University Dissertation Fellowship for the 1970-1971 academic year, and support funds from the University's Institutional Grants for Science. The School of Government and Public Administration absorbed the cost of duplicating data processing card decks. For this aid I am most grateful and appreciative.

Once again my wife rallied to the task of serving as editor, proofreader, and advisor. While she would probably join the author in expressing gratitude to all of those who assisted in the preparation of this study, she undoubtedly thanks God that it is over.

For errors and opinions expressed, no one bears responsibility for these but the author alone.

CHAPTER I

PRO-DEMOCRATIC GROUPS IN AMERICA

Few symbolic referents in American politics elicit more affection from the public than the concept of "democracy". Certain segments of society of course have reservations regarding the practical significance of the term democracy--the John Birch Society, for example, continues to insist that "America is a Republic, not a Democracy"¹--but many Americans apparently not only regard the idea with reverence but have considered the term sufficiently in their own minds to arrive at some definition of it. For example, the authors of a current popular textbook on American government report that "four out of five Americans can give a meaningful definition of the concept of 'democracy'." Basing their conclusion on public opinion research findings of the last few years, the authors further note that some 80% of those defining democracy choose to include both popular rule and freedom in their understanding of the term.²

¹This tenet of Birch Society ideology is amplified in "On The Differences Between A Democracy And A Republic," American Opinion, IV (January, 1961), 21-24; also see Robert Welch, "Republics And Democracies," American Opinion, IV (October, 1961), 9-35.

²Marian Irish and James Prothro, The Politics Of American Democracy, Fourth Edition (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968), p. 74; also see The American Voter (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964), pp. 171-83.

While a number of expert opinions about democracy might dispute such a definition, the significant fact which emerges is that American society is both aware of and articulate about the democratic character of the American political system.³ Admittedly, popular definitions may include other symbolic referents of imprecise normative meaning, and certainly few Americans include a concern with the concept of democracy in their daily activities. Nevertheless, some popular awareness and appreciation of the term can be said to exist, even if only manifested under the stimulus of some human agent such as a survey interviewer, a political party, or a political interest group.

DEFENDING DEMOCRACY

While it may be advantageous for a group in the American political system to subscribe to an undefined notion of "democracy" to attract a following, few groups make the general defense of democracy their central purpose, thereby indicating some judgment of pro-democratic or anti-democratic behavior or thought. As Murray Edelman reminds us, few groups are willing to articulate any firm commitment to a normative term such as "democracy" because "meanings are always a function of the context from which they issue, of the disparate needs and interests of the audiences involved, and of their respective modes

³An excellent catalogue of expert definitions of democracy can be found in Arne Naess, Democracy, Ideology And Objectivity (Oslo: Oslo University Press, 1956, pp. 277-329.

of perception. "⁴ In order to attract as large a following as possible, many groups purposely make their usage of such a term both vague and no more conspicuous than any other symbolic referent which may also constitute some portion of the group interest. ⁵

Perception Of Democracy:

A combination of factors may have produced the phenomenon whereby commitment to democratic principles, however arrived at, resulted in "democracy" becoming a predominant factor in the political interest of certain segments of American society. The case may be made that anti-democratic behavior has, in a peculiar manner, contributed to a strong belief in democracy among immigrant groups. Historical evidence seems to argue that ethnocentrism and nativism in America in the 1830's, by terrorizing "foreigners," restricting them from political activities and office, and limiting immigration, seemed to be acting contrary to the ideals of American democracy as they had

⁴Murray Edelman, The Symbolic Uses of Politics (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967), p. 130.

⁵Another portion of the group interest, according to classical group theory, would be an economically determined objective.

been introduced to Western Europe.⁶ Alexis de Tocqueville, for example, had praised the respect for rights and law in America,⁷ noting that, contrary to the nativist impulse:

In America, where the privileges of birth never existed and where riches confer no peculiar rights on their possessors, men unacquainted with one another are very ready to frequent the same places and find neither peril nor advantage in the free interchange of their thoughts. If they meet by accident, they neither seek nor avoid intercourse; their manner is therefore natural, frank, and open; it is easy to see that they hardly expect or learn anything from one another, and that they do not care to display any more than to conceal their position in the world. If their demeanor is often cold and serious, it is never haughty or constrained; and if they do not converse, it is because they are not in a humor to talk, not because they think it their interest to be silent.

In a foreign country two Americans are at once friends simply because they are Americans. They are repulsed by no prejudice; they are attracted by their common country. For the Englishmen

⁶For a discussion of the anti-democratic crusades against immigrants and "cultural aliens" during this period see: Carleton Beals, Brass-Knuckle Crusade (New York: Hastings Co., 1960); Ray Allen Billington, The Protestant Crusade 1800-1860 (New York: Rinehard, 1938); John R. Bodo, The Protestant Clergy and Public Issues 1812-1848 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954); Charles G. Hamilton, Lincoln and the Know Nothing Movement (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1954); John Higham, Strangers in the Land (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1955); Maldwyn Jones, American Immigration (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960); Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, The Politics of Unreason (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), pp. 34-67; Gustavus Myers, History of Bigotry in the United States (New York: Capricorn Books, 1960), pp. 110-63; Michael Williams, The Shadow of the Pope (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1932); Carl Wittke, We Who Built America (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University Press, 1970).

⁷Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy In America, Vol. I, (New York: Vintage Books, 1945; this version, translated by Francis Bowen, first published 1862) pp. 253-58.

the same blood is not enough; they must be brought together by the same rank. The Americans notice this unsociable mood of the English as much as the French do and are not less astonished by it.⁸

These views of America, devoid of bigotry, encouraged Europeans to the New World. Similarly, at a time when nativism, in the form of the Ku Klux Klan, was running amuck in America in the 1870s, James Bryce wrote:

The Americans are a good-natured people, kindly, helpful to one another, disposed to take a charitable view even of wrong-doers. Their anger sometimes flames up, but the fire is soon extinct. Nowhere is cruelty more abhorred. Even a mob lynching a horse thief in the West has consideration for the criminal, and will give him a good drink of whisky before he is strung up. Cruelty to slaves was rare while slavery lasted, the best proof of which is the quietness of the slaves during the war when all the men and many of the boys of the South were serving in the Confederate armies. As everybody knows, juries are more lenient to offences of all kinds but one, offences against women, than they are anywhere in Europe. The Southern "rebels" were soon forgiven; and though civil wars are proverbially bitter, there have been few struggles in which the combatants did so many little friendly acts for one another, few in which even the vanquished have so quickly buried their resentments. It is true that newspapers and public speakers say hard things of their opponents; but this is a part of the game, and is besides a way of relieving their feelings; the bark is sometimes the louder in order that the bite may not follow. Vindictiveness shown by a public man excites general disapproval, and the maxim of letting bygones be bygones is pushed so far that an offender's misdeeds are often forgotten when they ought to be remembered against him.⁹

It was not long, however, before such nativist movements became an embarrassment to the nation and a threat to the general social and

⁸Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 179-80.

⁹James Bryce, The American Commonwealth, Second Edition Revised, Vol. II, (London: Macmillan Co., 1891), pp. 273-74.

political order, thereby requiring that they be put down.¹⁰ Their faith in the American commitment to human rights and law somewhat restored, arriving immigrants found that such elements as the nativists in reality feared for the continuance of democracy and in their xenophobia were prompted to harsh actions because they saw in immigration a potential for losing their freedom, their rights, and their governmental system through the influence of foreign "invaders." Typical of this attitude were certain resolutions placed before the House of Representatives in 1837 and 1838 seeking to establish that immigrants, as one measure stated it, "mingle not in our political affairs" but "be content to be governed and seek not to govern" in their newly adopted homeland.¹¹

Immigration continued through the closing years of the 19th century, as did opposition to "un-Americans," "foreigners," and "aliens".¹²

¹⁰A direct consequence of Klan terrorism was the Civil Rights Act of 1871, 17 Stat. 13. See Homer Cummings and Carl McFarland, Federal Justice (New York: Macmillan Co., 1937), Chapters 12 and 24.

- ¹¹See Myers, op. cit., pp. 110-11.

¹²For a discussion of the anti-democratic crusades against immigrants in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries see: Paul F. Brissenden, The I. W. W. (New York: Russell & Russell, 1957); Ralph Chaplin, Wobbly (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948); Donald L. Kinzer, An Episode in Anti-Catholicism (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964); Milton R. Konwitz, Civil Rights in Immigration (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1953); Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, The Politics of Unreason (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), pp. 72-149; Robert K. Murray, Red Scare (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964); Gustavus Myers, History of Bigotry in the United States (New York: Capricorn Books, 1960), pp. 163-211ff; Louis F. Post, The Deportation Delirium of Nineteen-Twenty (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr, 1923); William Preston, Jr., Aliens and Dissenters (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963); John P. Roche, The Quest for the Dream (New York: Macmillan Co., 1963), pp. 1-76.

Racial persecution brought about organizations which sought to foster democracy by opposing discrimination. The American Jewish Committee was created in 1906, with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People following in 1909 and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in 1913. When nativism reached a fever pitch in the closing days of World War I and the Wilson Administration, the American Civil Liberties Union came into being to champion democracy by opposing racial, religious, or political persecution through judicial action.¹³

The "new Americans" were organizing not only for their own defense in the political arena but to strengthen democracy as well. Wanting to be good citizens, they took their education into naturalized legal status seriously, more often than not becoming indoctrinated with a legalistic view of government which stressed what "should be" in the political order rather than "what was" and encouraging active participation.¹⁴ The extension of the voting franchise, the "nationalization of the Bill of Rights," and the extension of civil rights and liberties

¹³The non-partisan, non-sectarian status of the American Civil Liberties Union is of particular interest here. For a discussion of its activities see: Donald Johnson, The Challenge to American Freedoms (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1963); Charles Lam Markmann, The Noblest Cry (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965).

¹⁴Of interest on the political socialization of immigrants is Edgar Litt, "Civic Education, Community Norms, and Political Indoctrination," American Sociological Review, XXVIII (February, 1963), pp. 69-75.

similarly contributed to a heightened sense of democracy in all aspects of politics.¹⁵

From these events an understanding and expectation of democratic practices came to exist within a segment of the American population. As E. E. Schattschneider observes of the modern democrats, they often define democracy first and then are confused by what they observe.¹⁶ Frequently they experience what one social scientist has characterized as "relative deprivation"--"discrepancies between their value expectations and their environment's apparent value capabilities"¹⁷--with two possible consequences: organization for social conflict or resort to violence.¹⁸

¹⁵Overtaking the doctrine of Barron v. Baltimore, 7 Pet. 243 (1833), the Supreme Court, relying upon the Civil War Amendments to the Constitution, has embarked upon a practice of attempting to make the first nine articles of the Bill of Rights applicable to the states as well as the Federal jurisdiction, thereby "nationalizing" the Bill of Rights. This practice was adopted by a majority of the Court with Gitlow v. New York, 268 U. S. 652 (1925).

¹⁶E. E. Schattschneider, The Semi-Sovereign People (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1960), p. 130.

¹⁷Ted Gurr, "Psychological Factors in Civil Violence," World Politics, XX (January, 1969), pp. 252-53. First utilized by Samuel Stouffer in his The American Soldier (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949), the concept of "relative deprivation" appears in a number of studies exploring the perception of injustice and its effects. For a review of these findings see J. Stacy Adams, "Inequity in Social Exchange," in Leonard Berkowitz, ed., Advances in Experimental Psychology, Vol. II, (New York: Academic Press, 1965), pp. 267-300.

¹⁸For theoretical foundations on group organization for social conflict, see Lewis Coser, The Functions of Social Conflict (New York: Free Press, 1956) and Georg Simmel, Conflict & The Web of Group Affiliations (New York: Free Press, 1955, portions first published in America 1904); for comparable theoretical material on civil violence see Ted Robert Gurr, Why Men Rebel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970) and Neil J. Smelser, Theory of Collective Behavior (New York: Free Press, 1962).

It is debatable if violence serves the cause of democracy in America. Indeed, it is probable that most Americans would regard violence as anti-democratic, while organization for social conflict in the cause of democracy is certainly accepted in the United States.

Social Movement To Formal Organization:

From common beliefs and expectations within a population aggregate, a social movement is born, "a social collective whose members voluntarily participate and for which the basic unifying factor is the psychological identification of the members with the movement. Its members normally share attitudes, values, perspectives toward the social process."¹⁹ The movement differs from a more developed form of collective interest in that it is without formal structure and, while it can offer judgments upon the social process, it cannot effectively make claims against other movements or groups. In brief, the emergence of a social movement constitutes the first step in the evolution of an interest group.

There is no single movement in America which has the defense of democracy as its sole cause but a variety of entities

¹⁹Samuel J. Eldersveld, "American Interest Groups: A Survey of Research and Some Implications for Theory and Method," in Henry W. Ehrmann, (ed.), Interest Groups on Four Continents (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1958), p. 180.

which describe the tenets of democracy, arguing their own special views of democratic practice. One student of social movements notes that, while any movement comes into existence to seek change in some aspect of the existing social order, its activities are affected by its particular ideology--"that is, a set of ideas which specify discontents, prescribe solutions, and justify change."²⁰ While a number of movements may commonly subscribe to generalized ideals of democracy, their separate ideologies intervene when a particular issue necessitates a statement of democratic practice.

As social movements persist they attempt to maximize their ability to make claims in the social order. A significant alteration in the movement's structure occurs when, in attempting to maximize their impact a step toward formalism takes place and "organization" ensues. This

develops when some of the members in the movement are designated to make decisions for the group. The development of organization is the process of delegation and distribution of power, the establishment of mechanisms of control, and the elaboration of all the apparatus of the decisional process.²¹

With the advent of organization, the nebulous voluntary network of the movement gives way to the more formal and exclusive "card carrying" membership of a specified group. And organization

²⁰Joseph R. Gusfield, "The Study of Social Movements," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. XIV, (New York: Macmillan Co. and Free Press, 1968), p. 445.

²¹Eldersveld, op. cit., p. 181.

usually results from a desire to gird for conflict which will itself bind a group and establish its boundaries.²² In the face of superior opposition, organized groups will enter into temporary associations or coalitions for a particular conflict situation.²³ And conflict on a non-personal basis, clothed in a belief system or ideology commonly held within the group, is likely to be more radical and merciless than those conflicts fought for personal reasons.²⁴

In terms of individuals who might be obsessed by group ideology, Josef Rudin notes there are personalities which express a "psychic . . . flare up . . . in the name of some ideal or of some term."²⁵ Such individuals are called "zealots" by Rudin. Juxtaposed to this personality type is one which might be termed the "crusader". Both the zealot and the crusader are firmly committed to a cause or, in terms of group ideology, both can engage in radical and merciless behavior toward a non-personal enemy. "But the intensity of the zealot can shift so much into the foreground that the cherished value itself slides into the background and is no longer truly and deeply

²²Coser, op. cit., pp. 33-39; Simmel, op. cit., pp. 87-124.

²³Schattschneider, op. cit., pp. 2-18; also Coser, op. cit., pp. 121-138.

²⁴David J. Finlay, Ole R. Holsti, and Richard R. Fagen, Enemies in Politics (Chicago: Rand McNally Co., 1967), pp. 10-11; also see Coser, op. cit., pp. 111-20.

²⁵Josef Rudin, Fanaticism (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969), p. 105.

experienced but becomes shallow and even falsified."²⁶ The crusader, like the zealot, may give up much of his personal interests to serve the group interest because of his intense commitment to the values and beliefs (ideology) of the group. But there seems to be a threshold which such a personality crosses as his commitment builds, carrying him from the realm of the crusader to that of the zealot: "the more intense one is, the less he is selective of ends and means. The dynamics usurp the law of action."²⁷

The Sectarian Bias:

The foregoing introduction embodies certain historical and conceptual presumptions. The latter are discussed in the next section. The former manifest themselves in the author's emphasis in this chapter upon those immigrant Americans who are motivated to come to the United States because of the promise--real or imagined, depending upon the individual's experience--of political freedom and civil role. In the process of becoming naturalized citizens, such immigrants are further socialized in terms of norms and values to be anticipated in a politically democratic America. The children of immigrants apparently undergo similar socialization through parental influence and education. In the case of the immigrant adult, the immigrant child, or a first

²⁶Ibid., p. 20.

²⁷Ibid., p. 21.

generation American, a heightened will to believe in democracy may be assumed to exist, making that individual less critical of the information provided in citizenship courses or the school civics curriculum.²⁸

Presumably, therefore, pro-democratic movements or organizations should contain a high proportion of recent immigrants or naturalized citizens. If such a group has a sectarian bias--i. e. modified by a special concern with a particular religion or race such as the Jews or Negroes--then the emphasis of its opposition to non-democratic practices may be upon certain forms of discrimination and first generation or new Americans may be present in greater numbers than in a non-sectarian group which does not give special attention to the concerns of these minorities. The most obvious explanation for this phenomenon is that of personal welfare; sectarian groups serve not only to preserve and protect democracy, which is what a non-sectarian group does as well, but also to assist the immigrant, particularly when the latter is a victim of racial or ethnic discrimination.

Thus, within the category of pro-democratic interest groups, two types are presumed to exist, the sectarian and the non-sectarian. The interest and membership of the two units would seem to be

²⁸These commonly held attitudes and opinions significantly change, however, with the third generation: see Gerhard Lenski, The Religious Factor (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1961), pp. 40-50, 295-97, 326-30.

significantly affected by the sectarian factor, the non-sectarian group having a more general view of democracy, seeing it as extending safeguards to all equally and affording no special protection to persecuted minorities. This distinction is illustrated by the fact that the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, in its efforts to protect Jews from defamation as a group, on occasion has presented legal challenges which some courts have viewed as infringing on constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech.

As another example, while some of the older Negro rights organizations, such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, have sought equal treatment of blacks in social, economic and political relations, the arguments of some Black Power advocates are that the black American has been repressed by white society and must now be allowed certain exclusive privileges; this may mean discriminating against otherwise equally deserving whites, or else aggressive rage, resulting from frustration, will manifest itself in violence. Other spokesmen for this point of view have sought black "reparations." While such interests claim to be serving the cause of democracy, their sectarian bias is self-evident. Whether this bias is justified or not, the non-sectarian organization escapes it, though it may be subject to bias of another kind. Non-sectarian support for the idea of the greatest good for the greatest number involves the danger of being insensitive to minority needs and minority rights.

GROUP POLITICS AND IDEOLOGY

By focusing upon the political activities of groups there is a conceptual as well as a historical presumption operative here. The "group basis of politics" has been a topic of debate within political science, although the controversy concerns matters of refining and developing, not abolishing the approach.²⁹ As a conceptual framework, the group view has suffered chiefly from intellectual biases of exclusiveness and globality. Is the "group" the significant unit of political analysis? Are groups to be found only within the policymaking spheres of government? What is the relationship of "interest" to group behavior? And so the questions have gone, seeking to clarify concepts and refine the model.

Biases And The Group Approach:

But two other biases seem to be inherent in the group approach in addition to the question of conceptual "fit". The group basis of

²⁹In addition to Eldersveld's previously cited contribution to group theory see: Robert T. Golembiewski, "The Group Basis of Politics: Notes on Analysis and Development," American Political Science Review, LIV (December, 1960), pp. 38-51; Earl Latham, "The Group Basis of Politics: Notes for a Theory," American Political Science Review, XLVI (June, 1952), pp. 376-97; Peter H. Odegard, "A Group Basis of Politics: A New Name for an Ancient Myth," Western Political Quarterly, XI (September, 1958), pp. 689-702; Mancur Olson, Jr., The Logic of Collective Action (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965); Robert H. Salisbury, "An Exchange Theory of Interest Groups," Midwest Journal of Political Science, XIII (February, 1969), pp. 1-32.

politics is, to some extent, culture bound in that it assumes few restrictions exist within a given population to impede the formation of a group or greatly hamper its behavior. Some degree of freedom is presumed to exist. While the group approach might fruitfully be applied to a totalitarian society, chiefly because the pure mass society base of totalitarianism has never really existed, group politics, as most theoreticians describe it, generally occurs in western democracies, republics, or limited monarchies.³⁰ Although intellectual currents of the group approach can be found in the English and German pluralists--Otto Gierke, Frederic Maitland, G. D. H. Cole, and Harold Laski--and Continental sociologists--Ludwig Gumplowicz, Georg Simmel, and Gustav Ratzenhofer--the creation of the group theory of politics was, indeed, an American product and has remained a preoccupation of social scientists in the United States. Both criticizing and developing the pioneer work of Arthur F. Bentley,³¹ political scientists in the United States have contributed to group theory through scrutiny of the effects of a particular policy arena on

³⁰See, for example, H. Gordon Skilling and Franklyn Griffiths, (ed.), Interest Groups in Soviet Politics (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970).

³¹Arthur F. Bentley, The Process of Government (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908).

group behavior,³² examining the type of policy choice,³³ following the actions of a single group over a variety of political terrain,³⁴ and exploring the relationship between the internal processes of a group and its behavior.³⁵ In brief, the group approach arises as an intellectual phenomenon derived from the American democratic experience where such groups flourish and are most visible. But a culture bound framework of analysis contaminates a research product only if applied to a foreign setting and in this instance subject and approach derive from the same culture.

A second type of bias is evident if the group is viewed as the only significant political entity, the individual thus being ignored. Leon Bramson views this practice as ideological in nature because it presumes a need to maintain the organized entities of society at the expense of individual welfare. In societies which stress citizen rights, Bramson feels this bias is less likely to affect normative conclusions drawn from the research.³⁶ The relationship between the group and

³²E. Pendleton Herring, Group Representation Before Congress (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1929); E. Pendleton Herring, Public Administration and the Public Interest (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1936).

³³E. E. Schattschneider, Politics, Pressures, and the Tariff (New York: Prentice-Hall Co., 1935).

³⁴Peter H. Odegard, Pressure Politics: The Anti-Saloon League (New York: Columbia University Press, 1928).

³⁵Oliver Garceau, The Political Life of the American Medical Association (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941).

³⁶Leon Bramson, The Political Context of Sociology (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), pp. 16-17.

the individual nevertheless has been one of the most vigorously debated points in the discussion of group politics. On the other hand, it should be recognized that the group approach is not the only conceptual framework suffering from some form of underlying ideological bias.³⁷

Refining The Group Approach:

If the only real problem in applying the group approach to American politics is one of intellectual clarity--and the ideological bias can be offset here too--then a restatement of group theory would seem to be in order. While there are many criticisms of Bentley's conceptualization of group activity, they may be distilled to a few items. Attempting to state his theory in behavioral terms and to avoid value questions, Bentley defeated himself on two levels. First, he ruled out of consideration "secondary qualities" which had preoccupied the moral philosophers. These "spooks," as he called them, were chiefly psychological factors which later came to be recognized as motive and conditioning elements in behavior: ideas, ideals, feelings, instincts, reasoning, etc. Accepting a model of behavior somewhat akin to that of his contemporary, the behaviorist John B. Watson (stimulus-response), Bentley relegated these psychological conditioning factors to virtual insignificance. At the

³⁷On this point see: William E. Connolly, Political Science and Ideology (New York: Atherton Press, 1967).

same time, however, he postulated a Madisonian model of balance, portraying the political process as "a balancing of quantity against quantity."³⁸ Such a bias for balance, together with the use of such terms as "body," "force," "laws of motion," "equilibrium" and "system," reveals that Bentley viewed the political process as analogous to a Newtonian machine.³⁹

While he implied that power (energy?) differences existed among the various groups, this was never made clear and the prospect of measurement was clouded by this confusion. What was clear, emphatically clear, was that the group stood as the only significant unit of analysis. As he himself stated in a now famous dictum: "When the groups are adequately stated, everything is stated. When I say everything I mean everything."⁴⁰

Some forty years later, David B. Truman sought to clarify and otherwise reinterpret some of Bentley's thinking about group politics. One of his first points of departure was a reformulation of the relationship between the individual and the group, according to which "the individual is less affected directly by the society as a

³⁸Arthur F. Bentley, The Process of Government (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967; first published 1908), p. 202 (all quotations are from this edition edited by Peter H. Odegard).

³⁹See R. E. Dowling, "Pressure Group Theory: Its Methodological Range," American Political Science Review, LIV (December, 1960), p. 945.

⁴⁰Bentley, op. cit., pp. 208-09.

whole than differentially through various of its subdivisions and groups."⁴¹ Further, Truman suggested that "the group experiences and affiliations of an individual are the primary, though not the exclusive, means by which the individual knows, interprets, and reacts to the society in which he lives."⁴² Ultimately he conceded a political role for the individual, noting "the individual" and "the group" are at most merely convenient ways of classifying behavior, two ways of approaching the same phenomena, not different things."⁴³ Borrowing from the writing of George Lundberg, Truman observed that institutions, or functional parts thereof, could be viewed as groups characterized by "a relatively high degree of stability, uniformity, formality, and generality."⁴⁴ He concluded that the concept of a political interest group "refers to any group that, on the basis of one or more shared attitudes, makes certain claims upon other groups in the society for the establishment, maintenance, or enhancement of forms of behavior that are implied by the shared attitudes."⁴⁵ Unlike the less formal social movement, the interest group is organized

⁴¹David B. Truman, The Governmental Process (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951), p. 15.

⁴²Ibid., p. 21

⁴³Ibid., p. 48.

⁴⁴George Lundberg, Foundations of Sociology (New York: Macmillan Co., 1939), p. 375, quoted in Truman, op. cit., p. 26.

⁴⁵Truman, op. cit., p. 33.

and prepared to press its claims. As will be noted, Truman's definition of interest group characteristics does not include any consideration of the role of ideology but his conceptualization is accepted for the present and will be re-examined at the conclusion of this research.

Ideology And The Group Approach:

Conceptually and methodologically, Truman's effort left much to be desired and subsequent critics have sought to refine his model. His stated objective was "to examine interest groups and their role in the formal institutions of government in order to provide an adequate basis for evaluating their significance in the American political process."⁴⁶ This may serve to explain Truman's inattention to interest groups of an ideological nature such as the post-war left-wing and right-wing groups operative at the time of his writing.⁴⁷ Another explanation,

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 505.

⁴⁷While it is always risky to speculate on inattention to source materials which seemingly lead to a view somewhat different from that of an author, the case here is most interesting for while Truman was writing he must have been aware of the hearings being conducted by the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the House of Representatives. This panel investigated such right-wing organizations as the National Economic Council, the Committee for Constitutional Government, and the Foundating for Economic Education. Left-wing groups which came under their scrutiny included Americans for Democratic Action, the Public Affairs Institute, and the Civil Rights Congress. Truman should have been somewhat more sensitive to the question of ideology raised by the activities of these groups. A contemporary study by a journalist does demonstrate such sensitivity: see Karl Schriftgiesser, The Lobbyists (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1951).

however, lies in his emphasis upon propaganda as a technique rather than actual subject matter and, further, the more fundamental point of equating the "rules of the game" with "general ideological consensus," an overlap which might imply that "to the extent that there is any ideological component in American politics, it is embracive and single."⁴⁸ Similarly, other students of group politics follow Truman by ignoring ideology or otherwise raising a question as to its significance in American politics.⁴⁹ European analysts from Bryce to Duverger also have accepted the idea that ours is a nonideological situation, at least if they assume that a Marxist measure of ideology will indicate the presence or absence of ideology in the United States.⁵⁰ Indeed, the somewhat long and confusing work of Daniel Bell, which has generated its own controversy and debate,⁵¹ seems to imply that "the exhaustion of political ideas in the fifties" means that political conflict resulting from class oriented doctrinal statements, woven together by

⁴⁸Harry Scoble, Ideology and Electoral Action (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1967), p. 38; Truman, op. cit., p. 512.

⁴⁹See, for example, Harry Eckstein, Pressure Group Politics (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1960); V. O. Key, Jr., Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups, Fifth Edition (New York: Thomas Crowell, 1964); V. O. Key, Jr., Public Opinion and American Democracy (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961).

⁵⁰See Maurice Duverger, Political Parties (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1954), especially pp. 418-21.

⁵¹See Chaim I. Waxman, (ed.), The End of Ideology Debate (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1963).

adherents to form a belief system, has come to an end.⁵²

Harry Scoble, however, suggests that, "having said this, one says only that there has been an end to political conflict based on a type of ideology rather than an end either to political conflict or to ideology itself."⁵³ Many studies indicate the existence of ideology among Americans,⁵⁴ and at least one textbook makes reference to ideological interest groups.⁵⁵ Such studies view the Marxian explanation of ideology as incomplete rather than inaccurate, for Marx regarded ideology as a dependent variable arising from class stratification rather than an independent variable characterized as "the scheme of thinking characteristic of any class or group."⁵⁶ The latter

⁵²Daniel Bell, The End of Ideology (New York: Free Press, 1960).

⁵³Scoble, op. cit., p. 39n.

⁵⁴See: Herbert McClosky, et. al., "Issue Conflict and Consensus Among Party Leaders and Followers," American Political Science Review, LIV (June, 1960), pp. 406-27; Herbert McClosky, "Consensus and Ideology in American Politics," American Political Science Review, LVIII (June, 1964), pp. 361-82; Robert E. Lane, Political Ideology (New York: Free Press, 1962); Robert E. Lane, Political Thinking and Consciousness (Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1969); Harry Scoble, Ideology and Electoral Action (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1967).

⁵⁵See Harmon Zeigler, Interest Groups In American Society (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Co., 1964), pp. 226-32; this use of the term is of a Marxian nature, however, for the author says "membership in an ideological group will be typified by certain class, educational, or income levels (p. 227)."

⁵⁶R. M. MacIver, The Web of Government (New York: Macmillan Co., 1948), p. 454.

view, that of Robert MacIver, leaves the question of the sources of ideology open and treats the concept as an independent variable.

Narrowing this general understanding of the term to the political setting, Scoble specifies ideology as:

involving statements about (1) the meaning and desirability of politics generally, including the individual's competence for political roles; (2) the authority, legitimacy, and proper institutional form(s) of government; (3) values to be maximized through government and politics, including but not limited to very specific policy goals; and (4) the prescribed mode of maximizing actions (that is, strategy and tactics).⁵⁷

It is Scoble's view that this definition should not be understood to mean that every interest group should make statements regarding all four of these contexts but rather that this conceptualization provides a crude measuring instrument "for determining how ideological a given interest group is."⁵⁸ Drawing upon previous research by David W. Minar,⁵⁹ Scoble operationalizes ideology as "characteristic thinking" which functions to (1) rationalize certain life conditions of the group members, (2) interpret the significance of the organization and its actions with regard to other groups (including institutions) and/or individuals outside the organization, and (3) persuade or reorient the objects of communication.⁶⁰

⁵⁷Scoble, op. cit., p. 40.

⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹David W. Minar, "Ideology and Political Behavior," Midwest Journal of Political Science, V. (November, 1961), pp. 317-31; Scoble, op. cit., p. 41.

⁶⁰Scoble, op. cit., p. 41.

Scoble's injection of ideology into group theory provides something of a revised model. The ideological interest is an emergent and developmental form of a new type of interest group, a broker in politics offering guidance and information. Such groups

help the individual focus on a limited number of significant electoral (or policy) outcomes. They provide a means for the individual to extend his nonvoting political activities beyond the artificial boundaries of federalism, and to link his actions with those of anonymous but relevant others. And in this kind of organization, the basis of "membership" is not social contact and interaction, but something akin to mass identification which links potential actors by their ideological congruence.⁶¹

Truman utilized the term "group" to refer basically to "any collection of individuals who have some characteristic in common."⁶² Thus, a common belief system, independent of class--the factor which often constitutes the "common characteristic"--could serve as the adhesive force for the group. But Truman also indicated some frequency of interaction among the individuals is necessary before a group can be said to exist.⁶³ Scoble suggests that this interaction need not be any form of person-to-person communication which implies personal identification and "also assumes perception and purposeful behavior and reciprocal action."⁶⁴ Instead, he says, "interaction"

⁶¹Ibid., p. 5.

⁶²Truman, op. cit., p. 23.

⁶³Ibid., p. 24.

⁶⁴Scoble, op. cit., p. 14.

should be characterized in both its subjective and objective dimensions so that "interaction is minimally defined as an impersonal-organization-to-person-to-organization action/reaction set (or vice versa)."⁶⁵

When an individual receives a printed appeal from a group--characterized at this point as a collection of interacting individuals with certain shared attitudes who are making claims against similar entities in society for the establishment, maintenance, or enhancement of certain forms of behavior which are suggested by the shared attitudes⁶⁶--he reacts by perhaps forwarding funds because he identifies with the group. For this he receives a newsletter and/or comparable ideological communiques. From time to time, the individual responds inwardly with inquiries and suggestions for the group and outwardly by taking some action which is a consequence of group shared attitudes. The newsletter, minimally, continues the interaction process with new ideas and communication.

While Scoble devotes considerable attention to the concept of ideology, he fails to provide any clarification between "pressure groups" and "political parties" or between "pressure groups" and "social movements." In fact, he seems willing to call all of them interest groups and to claim that the development of ideology within them obscures any differences they might have.⁶⁷ In part, this is a semantical problem

⁶⁵Ibid.

⁶⁶See Truman, op. cit., p. 33.

⁶⁷Scoble, op. cit., pp. 68-70.

but also it is a very serious failing in Scoble's research for some distinctions are evident even if all three entities do develop some ideology. As already noted, social movements can seemingly be distinguished from pressure groups in terms of the greater permanency of the latter and its organization. Further, the pressure group can be distinguished from the political party in that the pressure group generally seeks to influence specific policies while the political party attempts to achieve control over the machinery of government. The pressure group, of course, never submits to the general public for a sanction of its objective while the political party always submits, ultimately, to the public for such a sanction--the election of its candidate. Scoble characterizes the NCEC as a "pseudo-party" because he claims this term directs attention to the difficulty of differentiating among the three concepts under discussion. But why not call it a "pseudo-interest group," "pseudo-pressure group," or "pseudo-social movement." The reason would seem to be that Scoble senses that NCEC's activity, though indirect, in electoral politics places it in the generic classification of being a party. But because he asserts no distinction can be made between these concepts, he cannot actually explain his choice of label for to do so might reveal that distinctions do exist. Similarly, while he claims all three entities can be termed "interest groups," his own research raises suspicions that he may be making "interest group" synonymous with "pressure group." Even if such is not the case, Scoble provides no clarification

regarding the relationship of ideology to interest.

In the present research the term "interest group" is utilized to refer to a traditional "pressure group" type of organization. It is also speculated that this study of IAD will result in some concluding thoughts regarding current terminology concerning group theory and the concept of the interest group.

Non-Sectarian Ideological Groups:

This discussion of interest group activities began with an examination of the rise of pro-democratic groups and the sectarian biases inherent in such organizations. But what of the non-sectarian entities which claim no partisanship and no special arena for the expression of their claims for the establishment, maintenance, or enhancement of certain forms of behavior which, in their view, are consonant with democracy? Such groups, though few in number, do exist and have something of a tradition in modern American political history. They are propelled by an ideology and frequently conflict with other ideological groups over both public issues and public policy questions.

Just as Scoble characterized one group (the National Committee for an Effective Congress) as a "pseudoparty" because it seemingly obscures traditional distinctions between a political party and a pressure group, so too does the Institute for American Democracy blur, somewhat, distinctions between an interest group and a social movement. IAD

enjoys tax-exempt status and is prohibited from politics by the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. It cannot "lobby" in the traditional sense of that term. Its impact on political matters is always indirect, providing educational material to its own mobilized constituents and other organizations having a coincidence of bias on a given public question. But, it is organized, is linked with other groups, has an interest in public issues, and makes claims on other groups in society.

Every interest group develops some measurable ideology and, "while for many American political interest groups, preference and situation coincide to permit only a partial and implicit ideology, derivable from a position on an issue, there now seem to be tendencies toward the articulation of a total ideology in American politics."⁶⁸ The reasons for this trend derive from the postwar decrease in significant groups so that "the imperatives of organizational survival, considered internally, seem to require a total effort to embrace the individual member, " holding his loyalty through a broad program encompassing a variety of issues and thereby reducing the possibility of a member's defection to another group because of its greater appeal on some particular issue."⁶⁹ Another explanation of this trend

⁶⁸Scoble, op. cit., p. 69.

⁶⁹The reference to "significant groups" is made by Scoble and is thought to include characteristics of relative permanency, as opposed to an ad hoc status, and power, or the ability to frequently produce intended effects. See Ibid., pp. 69-70.

emerges when the survival necessity is considered externally, in the context of contemporary resort to government for problem solving. As noted earlier, groups come into being for the establishment, maintenance, or enhancement of forms of behavior consonant with their interest. Frequently their demands affect such a sufficiently large segment of the population as to be considered a part of the so-called public interest and thus require governmental sanction in order to be legitimated or binding upon the people. More often, however, competing demands arise and a conflict develops, its resolution requiring a legitimated governmental solution. The net result in either case is the politicalization of groups, i. e. plunging them into situations involving the authoritative allocation of values and momentarily conciliating them by bestowing a share in power "in proportion to their importance to the welfare and survival of the whole community."⁷⁰ The conflict situation can, of course, continue through a variety of decision arenas, a variety of related issues, and an unlimited period of time. Propelling and compounding these seemingly unending clashes is government itself for, as Schattschneider observes, "government has been aided and abetted by a host of public and private agencies and organizations designed to exploit every rift in the private world."⁷¹

⁷⁰Bernard Crick, In Defense of Politics (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1964), p. 21.

⁷¹Schattschneider, The Semi-Sovereign People, op. cit., p. 13.

IDEOLOGY AND THE INSTITUTE FOR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

As suggested earlier, ideology may be viewed as an independent variable. And, of course, it may be equally useful to recognize it as Marx did, as a dependent variable. In this latter regard, the question arises as to the specific causes of, in this instance, a pro-democratic or anti-extremist group's ideology, as opposed to general causes stimulating any interest group to generate some degree of political ideology. The Institute for American Democracy has three prime sources for its ideology. One factor certainly was tradition: organizations of its type had existed previously and the demise of its immediate predecessor left a situation where the absence of any such group created a heightened awareness of extremism or, in other words, intensified the anti-extremist ideology sufficiently to make the creation of a new group both desirable and financially practical (see Appendix I). Another factor which contributed to IAD's ideology was the distinctive nature of its prima facie cause, differentiating it from competitors such as the American Civil Liberties Union, the sectarian anti-extremist groups and civil right organizations. IAD opposed ideological extremism but did so claiming no sectarian or partisan bias as part of its interest, and confining its activities to no special area of public policy formation. A third factor resulted from the extremism issue brought on by the 1964 presidential campaign of Senator Barry Goldwater and the anticipated 1968 presidential effort of Governor George Wallace. IAD's predecessor,

the National Council for Civil Responsibility, was formed in late 1964 to offset the right-wing ideologues riding the Goldwater tide.⁷² The Council collapsed shortly after the campaign and it was not until 1967 when, with right-wingers again urging a presidential candidate reflective of their outlook, IAD was formed. These were not "stop Goldwater" or "stop Wallace" drives but attempts at "social pathology," efforts to keep the American body politic from succumbing to extremist slogans and innuendos about domestic subversion during a heated campaign.⁷³

And finally, once established, IAD not only had to communicate to the public but, more essential to the performance of its primary function of defending democracy by unmasking extremists, had to attract and sustain a membership through personal contact and interpersonal action. It was necessary to "create linkage with the established political identification of the potential contributorship" and this was accomplished "by communicating personal symbols and overt statements of ideology."⁷⁴ As Scoble notes, ideology takes on a vital role in an

⁷²While Goldwater was not swaying vast numbers of voters to his ideological position, ardent rightists found they could offer opinions which previously had been ignored for their extreme nature but which now were more acceptable because a contender for the presidency was articulating them as well.

⁷³The "social pathology" idea is explored in Franklin H. Littell, Wild Tongues (New York: Macmillan Co., 1969).

⁷⁴Scoble, op. cit., p. 70.

organization which operates without interpersonal interaction. Symbols and overt statements of ideology become the only way to communicate "meaning." While ideology becomes the means for establishing values and political identifications "and thereby [can] stimulate relevant behavior based on such impersonal interaction," it is also the means for transferring the contributor's established variety of political behavior by making many of his own political identifications consistent with the organization's image.⁷⁵ A non-partisan group, for example, might have special appeal to a voter who considers himself a political "independent".

Like the National Committee for an Effective Congress, and certainly a number of other organizations, the Institute for American Democracy constitutes one of the new groups in American politics, forcing some redefinition of "interest group" to accommodate its function and existence. While its ideological interest may not be new to political scientists, the effects of this belief system and its non-Marxian sociological nature are of more recent significance. Thus, it is necessary to examine the specific concerns of this research on the Institute and to consider as well the thinking which contributed to the particular hypotheses investigated in this study.

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 61.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH

Growing out of an initial interest in third party movements and stimulated by the growth of the American right-wing in the early 1960s, the explosion of Black Power in the mid-60s, and the development of the New Left in the late 60s, the present research is an examination of persons similarly interested in the growth and activities of ideological movements. It is, at the most basic level, a search for biases and explanations of the behavior of those concerned with and reacting to developments among the extremes of the American body politic.

At another level, it becomes a close scrutinization of a particular organization. With this more formal focus upon a group, personal interest coincides with intellectual attraction, for the Institute for American Democracy appears, at first glance, to be among those emerging entities in modern politics which, as Scoble was probably first to note, help certain individuals explore the political environment in a non-partisan manner, provide a means for participation beyond voting, and "link his actions with those of anonymous but

relevant others."¹ Ironically, while recognizing the dangers of ideological politics for the American democratic system, these anti-extremist organizations portray the activities of some actors in ideological terms simply for purposes of identification. Such groups do not necessarily condemn ideological politics but subscribe the more traditional view that the primary organizational framework in American politics should be party structure and a two-party system. Ideological considerations are secondary to partisanship. As Scoble notes, because the major parties are internally heterogeneous, they invite groups to form across them as well as within them.

Finally, at the third level of research, this study is an attempt to replicate the work of Scoble and to arrive at some new relationships between ideology and, in this case, anti-extremism. As applied here, Scoble's findings regarding ideology are re-examined but considerations of political activity and ideology are not made in terms of electoral behavior but in terms of the "educational" role IAD has chosen for itself. The replication is, therefore, only partial.

CONTINUITY AND DISCOVERY

Central to Scoble's study of the National Committee for an Effective Congress was the idea that, in contrast to the Marxian

¹Harry Scoble, Ideology and Electoral Action (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1967), p. 5.

CONTINUITY AND DISCOVERY

Central of Scoble's study of the National Committee for an Effective Congress was the idea that, in contrast to the Marxian conception, ideology may be considered as an independent variable. Proceeding on this assumption, three levels of analysis were attempted by Scoble and by the present study as well. At the most general level, IAD's ideology serves to justify resource allocations of time and money; "functions to facilitate a 'we-group' identification and to justify an ingroup-outgroup identification among fundamentally similar liberals; [and] it also functions as a propaganda or persuasion vehicle more broadly in society. "²

At the intermediate level, however, IAD's ideology has consequences for its organizational structure, functions, tactics and strategy. Like its predecessors, the Institute functions as a unique investigator which unmask the activities of the political extremes. In its educational capacity, IAD allows the glare of publicity to do its work and rarely takes any institutional action itself. The Institute does have interlocking ties to other groups through its leadership and frequently has an indirect effect on public issues by placing its research in the hands of sympathetic organizations or subtly urging its supporting members to undertake some action. Often, however, there is no real

²Scoble, op. cit., p. 71.

countermeasure available against extremist activities except to bring such behavior to public notice. A functioning conviction of IAD's ideology would seem to be an overriding belief in the effectiveness of public opinion in a democracy and faith in the rationality of the American citizen for making proper judgments once presented with the so-called "facts." For these reasons, open disclosure and unfettered communication are also part of the Institute's ideological outlook.

Expertise and Enemies:

The functional relationship between IAD and its contributing members is somewhat analogous to a doctor-patient situation, one expert for many loyal supporters within the community. The patient, however, is not the individual Institute supporter but American society, and the faithful occasionally supply information on observed symptoms which the expert "doctor" interprets, using an ill-defined method which one of IAD's founders and foremost leaders has referred to as "social pathology." Thus, everyone should be alert to extremism but only a few are presumed capable of determining its actual existence. According to this functional arrangement, it is not necessary that IAD's national office be large. The Institute's members need not interact with each other--perhaps they have no basis for interacting except through the national office--for information and analyses are shared equally with each member via IAD's newsletter. There is, of course, one danger in this arrangement: hypochondria. In brief, Institute

supporters may begin to see symptoms of extremism everywhere. Consistent resort to the expert and faith in the Institute's explanation controls this tendency somewhat. Greater familiarity with the subject matter also reduces misinterpretation, the necessity of thorough, comprehensive, and continuous research becoming a foremost function of the Institute's national office. A more dangerous manifestation of the hypochondriac condition, one over which IAD's leadership has little control, is "zealosity" or over-reaction to the activities of extremists and even the actual use of "extreme" methods to halt operations of an ideological enemy. The Institute has checked this possibility by discounting conspiracy theories as explanations of extremist behavior. If the ideological fringes are, however, shown to have great strength, zealosity may result; if portrayed as weak, then the reason for IAD's existence and operation comes into question. As a means of solving this dilemma, enemies are depicted by IAD as having a power potential which is offset by the investigations and very existence of the Institute itself. In other words, if IAD did not prevail, these extremists would be unleashed upon American society. Because the Institute does scrutinize these fringe politicians, they must be more covert and guarded in their attempts at making their influence felt.

This image of the relationship between IAD and extremists has a direct bearing upon checking the resort to zealosity. Institute members must remember that the freedom of a democracy necessitates tolerance

toward non-conformists and extremes so long as these elements do not infringe upon the rights of others. Thus, when IAD identifies political extremists as the enemy but points out that they constitute only a potential threat to democracy, the individual Institute member is actually being warned to be tolerant of this foe's existence while being alert to the possibility of covert attack.

The degree of ideological extremism assigned to an enemy allows IAD selectivity in choosing targets for investigation. Those seeking to destroy government, such as Communists, can be left to police scrutiny while the potential despoilers of democracy are singled out for observation. Enemies can be selected and emphasized on the basis of their power potential, making for variety in subjects and justifying the stressing of certain enemies within a class or exclusive attention to one class of extremists as opposed to another--e.g., the ultra-right rather than the ultra-left or black nationalists.

Finally, at the most concrete level of analysis, research can explore the relationship between the substance of ideology and the activities, characteristics, and attitudes of members of an anti-extremist organization. These tentative relationships are stated here in the form of three descriptive hypotheses and one causal hypothesis. While other linkages may emerge in the course of this analysis, these statements will be of central and conclusive importance to this study.

Political Participation Considered:

(1) The political activities of the membership of an anti-extremist organization reflect the political ideology of that group.

Theoretically, "political activity," suggests David Easton, "concerns all of those varieties of activity that influence significantly the kind of authoritative policy adopted for a society and the way it is put into practice."³ Reduced to more specific terms and confined to the context of American politics, such activity is organized by partisanship and can be ordered by what Lester Milbrath has called a "hierarchy of political involvement."⁴ Operationally defined, "political activities" refers to the individual's degree of partisan commitment and the extent of his participation in politics, as ordered by the Milbrath hierarchy scale. "Membership" refers, operationally, to the contributors supporting the organization. They can be identified by the inclusion of their names and addresses on the mailing list of the group.

In theory, an "anti-extremist organization" is one which assesses political actors and orders them along an ideological spectrum. Confining its activities and observations to no one social or political arena, this group determines, largely to its own satisfaction, the degree of left-wing or right-wing "extremism" a given political actor reflects

³See David Easton, The Political System (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953), p. 128.

⁴See Lester Milbrath, Political Participation (Chicago: Rand McNally Co., 1965), pp. 16-22.

and, minimally, it may bring the activities of that entity to public notice. While the ideological spectrum of analysis can be inclusive of any collection of political interests, such as business or labor, determinations of "extremism" remain highly subjective in nature. Judgments usually are made on the basis of observed behavior but become complicated by the inclusion of threatened action with actual deeds.⁵

References to an "anti-extremist organization" in this research are, unless otherwise stated, synonymous with the particular institution known as the Institute for American Democracy.

The term "reflect" would seem, upon first examination, somewhat imprecise to strict empiricists. Its use, however, avoids a problem of data "fit" which a more exact term might raise. Because this is a descriptive hypothesis, it is not anticipated that the subsequently generated data on the one side of the equation will mirror, no matter how translated, the information on the other side of the hypothesis. While there do not seem to be empirical referents to make so close a comparison, it is anticipated that the data and analysis will justify the

⁵On the (physical) behavior approach to extremism see Murray Clark Havens, The Challenges to Democracy (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965), pp. 90-91; on the (verbal) threatened action approach to extremism see G. B. Rush, "Toward a Definition of the Extreme Right," Pacific Sociological Review, VI (Fall, 1963), 64-73; for a discussion of the term see Dixon Gayer, "Extremism: That Indefinable Nothing," The Dixon Line, V (July-August, 1968), 1, 4-6, 16; on the relationship between government and extremism see Benjamin E. Lippincott, Democracy's Dilemma (New York: The Ronald Press, 1965).

use of this term or, to state the matter in another manner, utilization of this linkage referent does not bias or burden the research.

The theoretical understanding of "political ideology" was initially developed by Scoble who specified that it involved statements about the nature and purpose of politics, the role of government, values to be articulated, and tactics for obtaining goals.⁶ One need search no further than the statement of basic principles of the Institute for American Democracy to find a general indication of that organization's belief in political exchange and the individual's competence for a role in this activity:

The Institute does not promote a political line, nor is it engaged in politics. Its purpose is rather to assist groups of citizens to combat extremism and strengthen American loyalty within their own organizations--churches and synagogues, parents and teachers associations, trade unions, chambers of commerce, and the like. Totalitarian groups invariably attempt to rule or ruin competing centers of civic initiative; the Institute endeavors to strengthen all groups, whether "liberal" or "conservative," which shun conspiracy and ideological politics and participate openfacedly in the public dialogue.⁷

IAD encourages political activity though it seeks to keep its own involvement indirect. Its members are urged to participate in a multiplicity of organizations and programs, at all levels of government. In this same spirit, IAD gives the following advice to persons attempting to

⁶See Scoble, op. cit., p. 40.

⁷Institute for American Democracy, Memo to Sponsoring Committee, February 10, 1967, p. 2.

create a community anti-extremist organization: "Local councils or committees committed to the Institute's Basic Principles and supporting its work are self-constituted, self-governed and self-financed."⁸ An organizing handbook provides sample charters and action programs.⁹

Generally, IAD supports the authority and legitimacy of government, exceptions arising when certain institutions--e.g., the internal security committees of Congress or the Subversive Activities Control Board--seem inclined toward some "extremist" purpose. A fund appeal letter in late 1968 stressed that the Institute sought "to combat the threat of Extremism to America and American institutions."¹⁰ Similarly, a recent solicitation emphasized "a need to strengthen all the institutions which buttress our freedoms."¹¹ IAD encourages its members to petition government and to utilize due process procedures. No where is this better illustrated than in the Institute's championing of the "fairness doctrine" in public broadcasting.¹² The Institute has

⁸Ibid., p. 3.

⁹See Institute for American Democracy, Committee Handbook, Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (n.d.), pp. 29-37.

¹⁰Franklin H. Littell, letter of October 3, 1968, Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa.

¹¹Charles R. Baker, letter of June 22, 1970, Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C.

¹²For a concise overview of this policy area see Donald P. Mullally, "The Fairness Doctrine: Benefits and Costs," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXIII (Winter, 1969-1970), 577-583.

challenged broadcasters engaging in personal attacks and distortions of issues,¹³ pressed for license denial before administrative tribunals when the right-of-reply was refused,¹⁴ and exhorted its members and other interested parties to become involved in this issue area.¹⁵

Such activity leads to the question of values which IAD seeks to maximize. At the outset, one might ask where the Institute positions itself on the ideological spectrum?

Answer - In the middle. IAD does not take a position on issues, as such, or candidates, as such. We are concerned with extremist tactics which tend to shut off the free exchange of ideas so essential to democracy.¹⁶

Restating this commitment to open communications and unfettered political activity, an Institute memorandum characterizes the kind of behavior which it opposes.

At both extremes, the zealots attempt to stifle the free flow of ideas. Both think their ends justify means which cannot be acceptable to a democratic society. They slander their real or imaginary foes. They foment fears and hatreds and they repeat half-truths and falsehoods over and over again until they are believed.¹⁷

¹³See Homefront, I (October, 1967), 7; Ibid., IV (March, 1970), 23.

¹⁴See Robert Cirino, Don't Blame The People (Los Angeles: Diversity Press, 1971), p. 69; also relevant is Nicholas Johnson, How To Talk Back To Your Television Set (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1970).

¹⁵See Institute for American Democracy, How To Combat Air Pollution, Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (n.d.).

¹⁶Institute for American Democracy, "Memo to Citizens Inquiring About Some Specific IAD Policies," April 14, 1967, p. 1.

¹⁷Ibid.

Such a statement reflects the goals of the Institute by portraying the evils to be devalued.

IAD's impact becomes very difficult for this research to determine, however, because its goals are the idealized tenets of democracy, values which are generally supported by the public but not always defended. Organized for this defensive function, the Institute has even identified the despoilers of these tenets. Democracy is never really seriously damaged because IAD continues to unmask the enemy's advance and send him into retreat. One cannot, therefore, know if a group like the Institute is necessary until it is too late. This somewhat existential function inherent in IAD's ideology was expressed by its executive director, Charles Baker, in his comment that:

. . .when the word extremism appears in our literature we are referring to those efforts to impose an ideology on a substantial segment of the population by means destructive of the democratic process. Extremism is the reliance on methods which, when utilized by large numbers of people or carried out with sufficient resource, can not only inhibit the essential democratic process or open inquiry, and honest discussion and debate, but carried to the extreme, can eliminate them.¹⁸

From this one must ask, what strategy or tactics are available to the anti-extremist? To its members IAD assigns all of those practices which make a good citizen: regular voting, participation in civic affairs, keeping informed, lending support to the American democratic political system. To itself the Institute reserves an expert

¹⁸Gayer, op. cit., 6.

information role. As one fund appeal letter stated, "IAD believes that the only American way to thwart the extremists is by constant and effective exposure through public education."¹⁹ Indeed, the group's official motto declares its purpose as "Providing Knowledge To Help Safeguard Democracy."²⁰

Once informed, the membership receives additional encouragement to combat extremism in the local community. The flow of information, as one organizational blueprint carefully notes, creates no ties but an ideological one.

While IAD will fill many of the functions of a parent organization, the only binding tie will be that of mutual interest. IAD cannot assume the responsibility for the statements and actions of community groups composed of individuals on whom it may have no check and over whom it can exercise no controls. But this will not inhibit a close relationship, for the ties which bind us the closest are spiritual.²¹

Having said this, the Institute has suggested a number of tactics to combat extremist at the local level. These include:

1. intelligence - locating the sources of opinions on issues to determine if they derive from extremist propaganda and investigating the views of spokesmen to determine if they

¹⁹Steve Allen, letter of February 14, 1968, Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C.

²⁰This phrase appears on all IAD newsletters, letters, and most of its special publications.

²¹Institute for American Democracy, Memo to Sponsoring Committee, February 10, 1967, p. 3.

derive from an undisclosed extremist organization or are the individual's own feelings;

2. propaganda - if expressed opinions can be traced to an extremist source, then responsible disclosure of that source should be made;
3. education - sponsor debates and public forums where all points of view can be heard; remain open to all points of view but be prepared to challenge unfounded or emotional arguments; keep channels of communication open and confine the issue to meeting halls, not the streets; be aware of packed assemblies, semantic tricks, usurpation of speaking facilities, including radio talk shows, call-in programs, and semi-editorials;
4. legal petition - demand retractions for slander; invoke the "fairness doctrine;" inform roudies at meetings they will be removed by police if they disrupt the meeting.²²

While all of these ingredients constitute IAD's theoretical ideology, "political ideology" will, for this research, be operationalized to include non-partisan political activity and a high degree of political participation as ordered by the Milbrath hierarchy scale.

Social Characteristics Considered:

(2) The social characteristics of the membership of an anti-extremist organization reflect the political ideology of that group.

Theoretically, "social characteristics" may be broadly conceived to include the essential vital statistics of a population as well as those demographic factors associated with a highly developed society. In operational terms, however, the "social characteristics" of importance

²²Institute for American Democracy, Committee Handbook, op. cit., pp. 43-50.

in this relationship are sectarian or racial/religious identification.

The terms "membership," "anti-extremist organization," and "reflects" are utilized with the same theoretical and operational meaning described in the discussion of the first hypothesis.

"Political ideology" here refers, theoretically, to Scoble's first and third contextual statements about the meaning and basis of politics and values to be maximized in political activity. Operationally, "political ideology" refers to non-sectarianism; as such, it springs from the theoretical view that politics in America rests upon majority rule but not without regard for minority rights. In maintaining and improving democracy, IAD works for the so-called "greatest good of the greatest number" but not by allowing this utilitarian dictum to obliterate sensitivity to various forms of social, racial, or sexual discrimination which are repugnant to democracy. Issue or policy positions frequently are quite difficult to establish when the question of minority rights and majority rule enters the discussion. It is, however, this factor of non-sectarian bias which distinguishes IAD from close organizational relatives like civil rights groups. The Institute describes its foe in ideological terms, calling them extremists, and argues that the enemy can and will strike at any segment of the population. Civil rights organizations do not utilize ideological referents to describe their foe, term their opponents racists, and observe the enemy attacking only minority groups in American society.

Attitudes Considered:

(3) The social and political attitudes of the membership of an anti-extremist organization reflect the political ideology of that group. Theoretically, a multiplicity of terms could be utilized to describe an individual's "social and political attitudes." However, existing scales developed by social psychologists provide measures of relevant attitude syndromes having a theoretical relationship to the anti-extremist/pro-democracy belief system of IAD.²³ The briefest perusal of prior studies of ideological groups reveals that certain attitudes have been of continuous interest in these explorations and it is appropriate that these research emphases be extended to the present investigation. The reason for doing this is not to avoid pioneer inquiries but to create a basis for comparing extremist and anti-extremist attitudes. Social scientists frequently discuss the merits of replication, but rarely engage in this practice. As indicated previously, this survey of a "pseudo-interest group" duplicates, in part, Scoble's analysis of a "pseudo-political party." The two organizations exhibit similarities in their function of recruiting and channeling individual political actors into American politics in a manner unlike that of traditional parties and

²³See, for example, John P. Robinson, Jerrold G. Rusk, and Kendra B. Head, (eds.), Measures of Political Attitudes (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1968) and John P. Robinson and Phillip R. Shaver, (eds.), Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969).

pressure groups. Similarly, the utilization of attitude scales already applied in the study of extremist groups also constitutes a form of replication, but one which allows a useful comparison of populations. Operationally, then, "social and political attitudes" refers to the classical attitude syndromes of authoritarianism, dogmatism, and misanthropy.²⁴ A fourth viewpoint, which social psychologists would be reluctant to call an attitude, should also be included here in this operational definition. As noted previously, anti-extremists may become sufficiently aroused in opposing the enemy to resort to tactics which, were they more objective and detached, they would recognize as the devices of the very extremists they oppose. To explore this condition of "zealousy," which is not an attitude in the strict sense of that term, an index of questions was created to probe the anti-extremist's views regarding situations which (1) involved a question of democratic philosophy, (2) concerned a known policy position of the Institute for American Democracy, or (3) explored a civil liberties/civil rights proposition. Certain of these questions had been pretested and previously included in Scoble's survey of the membership of the National

²⁴The initial development and discussion of these syndromes appears, respectively, in: T. W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswick, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper, 1950); Milton Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books, 1960); Morris Rosenberg, "Misanthropy and Political Ideology," American Sociological Review, XXI (December, 1956), 690-695.

Committee for an Effective Congress.

Once again, the terms "membership," "anti-extremist organization," and "reflects" will be utilized with the same theoretical and operational identification described in the discussion of the first hypothesis.

"Political ideology" refers, here, theoretically, to Scoble's first, third, and fourth contextual statements about, respectively, the meaning and basis of politics, the values to be maximized through political activity, and the tactics to be utilized. In regard to the first of these --the basis of politics--the Institute's ideology seems to function to create cooperation and trust among its members. The belief in cooperation is evident in the attempt to foster independent local committees and in the desire to have these units only loosely linked with the national office of the Institute. Individual members are encouraged to provide IAD with information on local extremist activities and, through the organization's newsletter, receive comparable news about developments in other sections of the country.

Similarly, the ideology conveys the impression that most people can be trusted, that public officials can be relied upon, and that the American citizenry, once it has the "facts," will rationally and reasonably reject extreme behavior. Conversely, the Institute's ideology portrays the extremist as mistrustful, seized by what the late historian Richard Hofstadter called "social paranoia,"²⁵ and characterized by

²⁵Richard Hofstadter, "The Pseudo-Conservative Revolt--1955," in Daniel Bell, (ed.), The Radical Right (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1963), pp. 65-66; Richard Hofstadter, The Paranoid Style in American Politics (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), p. 4.

what IAD terms "persecution" by an imaginary conspiracy.²⁶

In terms of values to be maximized through politics, IAD's ideology functions to encourage an open mind and to recognize individual ability to make rational decisions. Local committees are urged to obtain and to consider all points of view in controversies where extremists are involved. Following this suggestion, IAD pursues the role of "expert" but does not claim to be a final authority in determining who is extreme. A variety of intelligent opinions from different sources may be presented on a given issue reflecting close agreement though not on conclusive solutions. The Institute's newsletter, Homefront, follows the practice of providing a monthly account of activities among groups, individuals, and publications which, admittedly, have been prejudged as extreme; the style of presentation is journalistic, occasionally a bit sensationalistic, but devoid of moralistic conclusions. If the reader disagrees with the account, he does so without having to shrug off an official final judgment as well. And in molding the anti-extremist belief system, IAD itself typifies the extremist as one having a closed mind and submitting to the authoritative views of his leaders.²⁷

Finally, with regard to tactics in politics, IAD has been careful to discourage over-reaction to extremists by stressing faith in govern-

²⁶Institute for American Democracy, Committee Handbook, op. cit., pp. 12-13.

²⁷Ibid., pp. 8, 15.

mental leaders, debunking conspiracy theories of extremist behavior, and relying upon public information and human reason to disarm the foe. In brief, IAD's ideology functions to foster a negative outlook toward the enemy but, simultaneously, to maintain a positive view toward democratic practices which suggest tolerance of potential despoilers of democracy. Those actually destroying the polity are left to police surveillance and judicial prosecution.

In operational terms, the "political ideology" of IAD may be defined as philanthropic (man as trustworthy and cooperative), anti-authoritarian (man viewed as capable of reasonable and rational decisions without resort to some source outside of himself for an ultimate opinion), anti-dogmatic (man as open minded), and opposed to extremists but not resorting to tactics utilized by this foe in his campaign against democracy (non-zealous). "Political ideology" has thus been operationalized in terms of the three attitude syndromes and jealousy index described earlier. In brief, members scoring high on authoritarianism, dogmatism, misanthropy, or "jealousy" would be considered to hold attitudes inconsistent with IAD's stated ideological position.

Ideological Cohesion Considered:

(4) The political ideology of an anti-extremist organization attracts group members regardless of their particular demographic characteristics. As previously suggested, ideology may be viewed as

an independent variable. Theoretically, ideology refers to bodies of doctrinal statements woven together to form a belief system. Traditionally, the Marxian notion of ideology as the way of thinking or beliefs of a particular class seems to have prevailed to the present time in most studies of ideology. What Marx suggested was that ideology was dependent upon class structure, that "social being" determines "consciousness."²⁸ Operationally defined here, however, ideology refers to statements about (1) the meaning and desirability of politics or the need to keep it open and devoid of extremists' advances and (2) the authority and legitimacy of government or the need to protect it from violent overthrow or attacks against its leaders and operations, whether these assaults be overt or covert in nature.

As noted before, "anti-extremist organization" refers, operationally, to the Institute for American Democracy and "group members" are defined as those subscribers who receive IAD's newsletter and are thus considered members of the organization.

"Common demographic characteristics" is defined operationally to include income level, educational level, and age.

COMPARISON AND EVALUATION

In studying so-called anti-extremists, a framework for comparison

²⁸See, for example, T. B. Bottomore, (ed. and tr.), Karl Marx: Selected Writing in Sociology and Social Philosophy (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964), pp. 24, 56-59.

emerges for considering them vis-a-vis certain identified "extremists." Rather than resorting to any extended theoretical discussion of the concept, recognized ideologues of the left and the right who have been examined in other studies can be termed "extremists." IAD members, who purport to be representative of the "middle-of-the-road" can be compared with members of left-wing organizations and supporters of right-wing organizations. Variables must, however, be selected for which the various studies provide information and which suffer no bias resulting from their manner of collection.

Nature of Comparisons:

Research on the attitudes and demographic characteristics of the membership of political organizations, whether ideological or not, is a relatively recent phenomenon. To date, in-depth studies have been done on the NCEC, the John Birch Society,²⁹ and the Conservative Party of New York.³⁰ Surveys of individuals holding extreme ideological views, but not necessarily linked to a particular organization, also

²⁹John A. Broyles, "The John Birch Society as a Movement of Social Protest of the Radical Right," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, Boston, 1963); published in modified form as J. Allen Broyles, The John Birch Society: Anatomy of a Protest (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964).

³⁰Robert A. Schoenberger, "Conservatives and Conservatism: A Study of the Attitudes and Characteristics of Conservative and Republican Party Members," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Rochester, Rochester, 1967).

provide some useful comparative data. Such studies have been completed on Communists³¹ and supporters of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy and rightist causes.³² Finally, at relevant points, data on the beliefs and behavior of a random national sample of the American population may provide useful comparative information.³³

It may be relevant to note at this juncture that ideological interest groups present certain problems for research, a fact which serves to explain why few such studies exist. For example, students of left-wing political activity in the United States agree that the extremes of this sphere tend to operate through fleeting associations rather than lasting formal organizations. Indeed, one of the tenets of New Left ideology emphasizes loose organizational structure and informal leadership. Most

³¹Gabriel A. Almond, The Appeals of Communism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954).

³²See: Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, The Politics of Unreason (New York: Harper & Row, 1970); James McEvoy III, Radicals or Conservatives? (Chicago: Rand McNally Co., 1971); Ira Rohter, "Radical Rightists: An Empirical Study," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1967); Raymond E. Wolfinger, Barbara Kaye Wolfinger, Kenneth Prewitt, and Sheilah Rosenhack, "The Clientele of the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade," (paper read at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, New York, 1963), a revised version appearing in David E. Apter, (ed.), Ideology and Discontent (New York: Free Press, 1964), pp. 262-293.

³³Of particular relevance: Lloyd A. Free and Hadley Cantril, The Political Beliefs of Americans (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968); Samuel A. Stouffer, Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966; originally published 1955).

leftist groups operate in what might be described as "privacy," out of the public purview, receiving little attention in the media except for mass demonstrations and rallies. At the outer fringes of the spectrum, leftists operate in secrecy. The less extreme elements do not wish to be bothered by interviewers and questionnaires, the more extreme flatly refuse to cooperate.³⁴

Rightists, on the other hand, create multiple organizations which exhibit a high degree of permanency. In addition to receiving a larger amount of media exposure, on a day-to-day basis, than their leftist counterparts, the American right-wing produces a multiplicity of publications which trumpet their activities. Certainly the fringes of the right also operate in secrecy, but another factor limits research on less extreme right-wing organizations. Historian Richard Hofstadter called the factor "social paranoia."³⁵ So fearful of imagined conspiratorial forces is the rightist that he has launched efforts to undermine social science, to portray it as subversive.³⁶ Such views pose crucial challenges to researchers interested in probing this area of political activity; methods will have to be developed which will permit the

³⁴See, for example, Kenneth Keniston, Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968), pp. 3-13, 291-297.

³⁵Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 4.

³⁶See Harold M. Prosharnsky and Richard I. Evans, "The 'Radical Right:' A Threat to the Behavioral Sciences," Journal of Social Issues, XIX (April, 1963), 86-106.

continuation of studies in this field but without endangering the individual's right to privacy.

One of the points of comparison between extremists and anti-extremists concerns attitude syndromes. Items selected from a particular scale often differ with each study. Social psychologists point out that their studies of attitudes are based upon the use of full scales or carefully pre-tested partial scales. As applied in most of the studies of ideological group members, researchers have simply selected those items which seem to have the best face validity and also discriminate sharply as to the presence or absence of the attitude in question. Some attention is usually also given to response sets when selecting questions. Because a true scale is not utilized, however, a valid comparison of members of the same population, who have answered the same questionnaire items concerning an attitude syndrome, is not possible. Individual respondents can be said to reflect the attitude characteristic in question but the extent of their commitment cannot be determined in the absence of a developed scale. It is this factor which limits precise comparison within or across populations tested for the same attitude trait but by means of incomplete scales.

Attitudes and Extremism:

Previous studies of ideologues and their organizations have made extensive use of three attitude measurement scales or partial scales. These scales measure three syndromes: authoritarianism, misanthropy,

and dogmatism. At its inception, the measurement device for determining the presence of an authoritarian attitude was called the F scale, derived from the developer's belief that they were dealing with a habit of mind peculiar to fascists (F) or extremists of the right.³⁷ It was disagreement over this point that led to the creation of the dogmatism (D) scale. The originator, Milton Rokeach, "regarded dogmatism as a characteristic of individual cognitive structure, not tied to a specific ideology."³⁸ It is now generally accepted that authoritarianism, as measured by the F scale and its derivatives, is an attitude associated with right-wing ideologues who are characterized by

the tendency to conform, to adhere rigidly to conventional values, complemented by a tendency to condemn others who violate such values (this can be related to general hostility toward out-groups and positive attitudes toward in-groups); the tendency to submit uncritically to, to identify with, the strong leaders of in-groups, accompanied by a desire to dominate those considered weaker than oneself (this involves a general preoccupation with power relationships); the tendency to concentrate upon externals to be "anti-intrceptive" in relation to one's own experience, to blame one's troubles on a hostile and threatening environment; the tendencies to think in terms of stereotypes and superstitions, to be cynical about other people's motives; and the tendency to be fearful and suspicious of sexual impulses.³⁹

³⁷On the development of the F scale see: John P. Kirscht and Ronald C. Dillehay, Dimensions of Authoritarianism: A Review of Research and Theory (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967), pp. 1-34; John Madge, The Origins of Scientific Sociology (New York: Free Press, 1962), Chapter 11.

³⁸Kirscht and Dillehay, op. cit., p. 11.

³⁹Louise Harned, "Authoritarian Attitudes and Party Activity," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXV (Fall, 1961), 393-394; also see T. W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levinson, and R. Nevitt Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper, 1950), pp. 102-150, 222-279.

Given these traits, there is reason to believe an authoritarian might be attracted to a group like the Institute for American Democracy. The anti-extremist organization could be viewed as a protector of the status quo which punishes deviants. The focus upon making democracy a viable and functioning concept is always in terms of power relationships, and extremists easily translate into stereotyped "enemies" who might be viewed as responsible for a variety of social and political ills. While the tendency to be cynical and mistrustful of other's motives is explored further by the misanthropy scale, the authoritarian's tendency to be fearful of sexual impulses would have interesting consequences for the IAD members who learn the organization supports and protect the sex education programs of public schools from extremist assaults.

Viewed as a correlate of ideology but not tied to a specific belief system (like the F scale), dogmatism is

(a) a relatively closed cognitive system of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, (b) organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority which, in turn, (c) provides a framework for patterns of intolerance and qualified tolerance toward others.⁴⁰

In regard to this third aspect of dogmatism, Herbert Hyman has commented upon the behavior of rightists who are intolerant but who do not fear the climate of opinion they create by this attitude;

⁴⁰Milton Rokeach, "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism," Psychological Review, LXI (May, 1954), 203.

"they are the agents of intolerance, not the victims." The intolerant, in fact, seek a division within the population over this precise point: those who join the rightist in his intolerance are not to be feared while those who ignore his attitude may hold the kinds of opinions that, for the rightist, are a cause for fear.⁴¹ But it was not Rokeach's desire to limit dogmatism to the rightist's habit of mind. It is both a political and religious perspective which is characterized by

a closed way of thinking which could be associated with an ideology regardless of content, an authoritarian outlook on life, an intolerance toward those with opposing beliefs, and a sufferance of those with similar beliefs.⁴²

In studying IAD, the membership was known to contain a relatively high number of ministers and religious leaders. Because dogmatism is characteristic of some churchmen, one might expect that it would carry over into political beliefs. Or one might, in discovering dogmatism, view it as a signal of intolerance toward extremists, an intolerance which ultimately can lead to the adoption of anti-democratic methods to destroy not only the despoilers of democracy but any nonconformist. This "imitation of the enemy," is actually one of the first steps toward extremism.⁴³ Awareness of this possibility led to

⁴¹Herbert H. Hyman, "England and America: Climates of Tolerance and Intolerance," in Daniel Bell, ed., The Radical Right (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1963), pp. 229-230.

⁴²Milton Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books, 1960), pp. 4-5.

⁴³Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 32.

the development of the "zealousy" index discussed later in this section.

The third attitude syndrome considered in this research--misanthropy--grows out of the authoritarian's mistrust of other's motives but has broader implications for this research on IAD. In brief, "since a political system basically involves people in action, the individual's view of human nature is likely to be linked to his evaluation of how well the system actually works."⁴⁴ The defense of democracy and the "education" method of dealing with extremists presuppose a high degree of rationality among a citizenry which is, in fact, capable of self-government. Rosenberg reminds us that an individual's stand on public issues or policy questions can be influenced by his view of human nature. Indeed, as his own research indicated,

the misanthropic respondents were more likely than others to be dubious about freedom of speech or to advocate its restriction. Since one can no more imagine a democracy without freedom of speech than without representative government or other civil rights, it appears that faith in people is clearly related to belief in the feasibility of the democratic form of government.⁴⁵

And, again, the misanthropic habit of mind led to the development and inclusion of an index in the questionnaire which dealt with over-reaction to extremists, a condition described earlier as "zealousy."

⁴⁴Morris Rosenberg, "Misanthropy and Political Ideology," American Sociological Review, XXI (December, 1956), 690.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 692.

Recognizing "Zealousy:"

Previously discussed was the possible presence of both a "crusader" personality and a "zealot" personality in a group like the Institute for American Democracy. Both types can be firmly committed to the cause of anti-extremism but are capable of engaging in merciless behavior in attacking the enemy. "But the intensity of the zealot can shift so much into the foreground that the cherished value itself slides into the background and is no longer truly and deeply experienced but becomes shallow and even falsified."⁴⁶ The crusader, like the zealot, may give up much of his personal interests to serve the organization because of his intense commitment to the ideology of the group. But, as commitment builds, there is a threshold to be crossed, a distinct midpoint in the transition from crusader to zealot: "the more intense one is, the less he is selective of ends and means. The dynamics usurp the law of action."⁴⁷

To assess this condition of zealosity, an index was prepared from items located at various points throughout the survey questionnaire. These questions begged a response to a situational question, a hypothetical case. The subject matter of these items may be described as being of three types: those dealing with a classic civil liberties situation,

⁴⁶Josef Rudin, Fanaticism (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969), p. 20.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 21.

those posing a question involving classic democratic theory, and those involving a contemporary social or political issue on which IAD was known to have a position. The use of the descriptive term "classic" is intended to convey the idea of long-standing theoretical acceptance. Indeed, the alert college student or informed citizen might immediately recognize that certain of the questions had popular or socially acceptable answers but the variety of items used in scoring probably offset this face validity problem. In brief, what the index sought to determine was whether or not an anti-extremist would utilize means contrary to the guaranteed rights of the Constitution, contrary to democratic theory, or contrary to the policies of IAD to counteract the despoilers of democracy.

SELECTING THE INSTITUTE FOR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

When the decision to study an anti-extremist group ultimately was made, four such organizations existed. One of these, Group Research, Inc., was eliminated because it had no action program, had no membership concept, and limited itself to research. Geography and operational stability figured foremost in selecting a target group from among the other three. The Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, located in New York, was a dormant entity which showed no signs of real world operation. The Freedom Institute at Iowa Wesleyan College indicated some activity but of a regional nature only and attracted a very small following. It ultimately was phased out in 1970 and semi-merged with IAD which became the heir of its printed matter. By the time a decision had been

made to do this research, the Southern Committee on Political Ethics, located in Washington, had ceased operations. Designed as a vehicle for opposition to the candidacy of George Wallace during the 1968 campaign, the Committee was negotiating for merger with IAD and oblivion when this research was begun.

The Institute for American Democracy became the likely target because it was a national organization with a membership in the thousands. It had been operating successfully for a couple of years and it was accessible. Of critical importance too, as always in research of this type, was the Institute's early recognition of the author's professional interest in ideological interest groups. When a survey of the Institute's membership was suggested, IAD was receptive to both the idea and the investigator. Correspondence and memo files were made available and the author held a participant-observer staff position during the summer months of 1969. At no time did any individual associated with IAD attempt to influence research findings, conclusions, or survey procedures. Throughout the research process IAD demonstrated a strong, but detached, interest in the study. The author has delivered one preliminary report of findings before the Institute's Board of Policy, has made aggregate survey findings available, and will provide a copy of his final report to IAD.

Resources for this research have been of four types. Interviews, both formal and informal, have yielded a small amount of highly important historical information. As noted previously, the author enjoyed a

participant-observer status at one point. Library research has not been excessive but the Institute has provided both primary and fugitive documents which have contributed significantly to the historical and operational aspect of this study. The major research instrument utilized was a mailed questionnaire.

Questionnaire Structure:

Patterned after the NCEC survey instrument, the IAD questionnaire differed from Scoble's model by de-emphasizing electoral activity and the respondent's sources of political information. Questions dealing with political participation were included but the thrust of the questionnaire was toward gathering information which would reveal ideological conviction, the presence of certain attitudes, and policy-issue areas of concern to IAD members. Both the NCEC survey and the present one collected a large amount of demographic data and pursued opinions about the respective organizations in question.

With occasional minor word alterations and slight substitutions of items, for reasons already indicated, the IAD questionnaire duplicated the style, order, and questions utilized by Scoble in his survey of NCEC members. Items probing opinions on current issues--designed to measure ideological outlook--were drawn from a variety of sources. A question on the 1968 Chicago demonstrations at the Democratic National Convention, which was developed, administered, and reported upon by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, was included for comparative

purposes (Question #4a).⁴⁸ Some items on issues known to be of interest to IAD members were prepared by the author (#4c, 4d, 4e, 4f, 4h, and 4m). Some discussion of these items was made with knowledgeable colleagues regarding the face validity, content, and scoring of the questions but no actual pre-testing was carried out. One item from Scoble's original questionnaire was included (#4b). Four questions were included from a survey instrument developed by Robert A. Schoenberger in his study of conservatives (#4g, 4i, 4k, and 4l).⁴⁹ These items were selected for their face validity and discriminatory effect.

Respondents were asked to react to a group of organization names, indicating the extent to which they liked or disliked them by rating each on a five point scale (Question #5). Adapted from Scoble's original questionnaire but modified here, the list of names initially was developed by scanning the index to IAD's newsletter, Homefront. Groups were selected which had received either frequent or extended discussion in this publication and which therefore would be somewhat familiar to respondents. After this list was prepared, close ideological opposites were paired with each organization selected. Finally, a few groups of low visibility, popularity, and public controversy were added to the list (e. g. Sex Education Information Council, Unitarians, Sierra Club,

⁴⁸See John P. Robinson, "Public Reaction to Political Protest: Chicago, 1968, " Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXIV (Spring, 1970), 2.

⁴⁹See Schoenberger, op. cit., pp. 157-160.

and American Security Council). The rating scale also included a "not familiar with" category. Generally, it was hoped that respondents would indicate the extent of their own ideological outlook, the direction of their view of the "enemy," their degree of intolerance, and the breadth of their familiarity with the various groups. Ideological outlook, as measured here, could then be compared with other measures of this variable for the same respondent and ultimately for the whole population under examination.

Attitude Scores:

Similarly, items were selected from developed scales for measuring authoritarianism, dogmatism, and misanthropy.⁵⁰ These questions, though extracted from a variety of sources, again were chosen for their face validity and discriminatory effect with some reversed items included as well. These were then mixed together on the questionnaire page and presented to the respondent as "questions concerning social viewpoint, family opinions, and individual outlook (Question #10)." Following a procedure suggested by the Institute for Social Research, these attitude items were scored on a four point scale as rough indicators of the attitude trait in question.⁵¹ Scores above the ideal midpoint of

⁵⁰See: John P. Robinson, Jerrold G. Rusk, and Kendra B. Head, Measures of Political Attitudes (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1968); John P. Robinson and Phillip R. Shaver, Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969).

⁵¹See Survey Research Center, Manual for Coders (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1961), p. 23.

3.0 would indicate the presence of the attitude while scores below this would reflect its absence. Questions as to the degree of attitude commitment cannot be answered from this information as a full scale was not used in any case. Only crude comparisons can be made between IAD members in terms of attitude syndromes, and any comparison between this population and any other identifiable group on this variable is even more tenuous due to scoring procedures. The length of the questionnaire made the use of full scales prohibitive. Such abbreviated scales as used here have utility so long as their limitations are realized; more satisfactory short forms of these scales no doubt will be available for this kind of research in the near future.

The remaining portions of the survey instrument require no extensive discussion except to elaborate upon shortcomings of the questionnaire and later coding difficulties it presented. This discussion is reserved for the final pages of this chapter.

SAMPLE AND RESPONSE

The Institute for American Democracy, like many of its predecessors, does not offer formal membership to those interested in its operation. As indicated in the discussion of its organizational structure, IAD services a variety of institutions, informal groups, and "grass roots" individuals, functioning as both an information clearinghouse and as an expert consultant. No encouragement is made for intermediary levels of organization between the Institute and its clients, though IAD

has inherited some local anti-extremist committees from its predecessor, the National Council for Civic Responsibility. Membership in IAD is synonymous with subscription to its newsletter. Yet, because there is some interaction, the concept of membership cannot be limited, in the case of IAD, to subscription alone. Recipients of Homefront do correspond and send information to the Institute's offices. Newsletter readers are stimulated to be aware of the latest extremist activities. The dialogue of membership is present but it is a monologue oftentimes, between a talkative IAD and the member who hears but is mute.

Affiliation with IAD may be as a Homefront subscriber (\$5-10 annually), as a newsletter subscriber who also receives occasional special background reports on current developments (\$25-100 annually), or as a honorary supporter (\$1000 plus annually). An examination of membership lists (mailing lists) indicates, however, that those in the second category of affiliation tend to be nonpersonal addressees, i. e. organizations, libraries, and very few individuals. Indeed, the second category, by comparison with the first group, is quite small. And those in the third level of affiliation number no more than a dozen individuals, most of whom serve the organization in a leadership capacity. In brief, the identifiable rank-and-file member is to be found in the first level of affiliation and it was this population which was surveyed.

In late May, 1970, the questionnaire was readied for administration and a full list of individuals affiliated with IAD on the first level

of membership was obtained. This population numbered almost 4,000 names and a randomly selected sample then was drawn, totaling exactly 400 names. In instances where a mailing label indicated a joint membership, a coin was tossed to determine the respondent. No more than a dozen of those surveyed ultimately had to be determined in this manner and even fewer of those surveyed had nonpersonal addresses.

A letter was sent in late May to the selected respondents indicating how and why they had been selected for participation in this research. Printed on an IAD letterhead and signed by the Institute's executive director, this letter urged those selected to participate. It was administered totally at the author's expense and contained an address and personal salutation for each respondent.

Approximately two weeks later the questionnaires and an explanatory letter were sent to each respondent. The letter was printed on the letter head of the American University, contained an address and personal salutation, and was signed by the author. The questionnaire contained only an identification number, necessary for control purposes. Return postage was enclosed.

In early August letters were sent to nonrespondents in the survey, asking them to complete their questionnaires. This letter again contained a university identification, no respondent address, an impersonal salutation, and was signed by the author. The respondent's identification number was included below the body of the letter.

Finally, in early September, those who still had not returned

the original questionnaire were sent an abbreviated form. The initial survey form contained twenty-two pages. The edited form totalled only six pages with items mainly concerned with attitudinal responses and demographic data. A cover letter was enclosed, again containing the university identification. No respondent address was included though the identification number did appear again below the body of the letter. An impersonal salutation was used and the letter was signed by the author. These documents are included in an appendix attached to this report. No questionnaires were tabulated after October 1.

After the IAD introductory letter was mailed in late May, six of these were returned for reasons of incorrect address. Because these respondents, in effect, could not be contacted, replacements were selected and this identical letter was sent to them. At no other time were respondents so replaced in the survey. By October, 231 long forms of the questionnaire had been returned and twenty eight short forms, totalling 259 responses (64.7%). This is an exceptionally good response, particularly when it is recalled that the majority of these people were asked to answer twenty-two pages of questions. Very few failed to complete every question!

PROBLEMATICS

Any research usually reveals a few problems which are, at some point, worthy of comment to further explain the research and findings as well as to inform those interested in undertaking similar studies.

The use of mailed questionnaires in social science research continues to develop,⁵² but the determination of particular factors increasing or decreasing response rates in this type of study remains unsettled.⁵³ While no careful attention was given to studying this aspect of the present research, nevertheless one is impressed with certain practices and conditions peculiar to this project which induced a high number of respondents to answer a laborious twenty-two page questionnaire. High among the factors exerting a positive effect was the utilization of an introductory letter to participants from the national office of the organization under study. Such a letter assures those asked to respond that the research project is responsible, serious, and potentially beneficial. It also demonstrates that the organization feels its own operations are honorable and just. Having been thus introduced, the researcher further ingratiates himself with his respondents through some form of personal identification of the latter and an informal style in his questionnaire. Both the IAD introductory letter and the author's cover letter with the initial questionnaire contained the respondent's full address and a

⁵²Valuable basic material can be found in: William Crotty, "The Utilization of Mailed Questionnaires," Western Political Quarterly, XIX (March, 1966), 44-54; A. N. Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement (New York: Basic Books, 1966), pp. 30-35, 65-67; Harry Scoble and Stanley Backrach, "Mail Questionnaire Efficiency: Controlled Reduction of Non-Response," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXI (Summer, 1967), 265-277.

⁵³For a concise overview see Alan R. Andreasen, "Personalizing Mail Questionnaire Correspondence," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIV (Summer, 1970), 273-277.

personal salutation. This was dropped in follow-up letters which were styled more in the format of informal notes. Respondents were told the nature of the research and the procedures involved, and were assured of anonymity and confidentiality. Anyone having questions or doubts about the study was encouraged to call or write the author. Only one person wrote to ask how her name was obtained. She was told and again urged to participate but did not ultimately do so. An interesting reflection of the general confidence and trust prevailing among the respondents, however, is demonstrated by two particular cases. One participant returned a completed long form which indicated he held highly conservative views and participated in some organizations which IAD had labelled "extremist." His views appeared to be consistent and valid. Another respondent returned a partially completed long form which indicated he held quite extreme anti-communist views and related rightist opinions. He seemed to fancy himself a spy and regarded IAD as sympathetic to Soviet Communism. Still, he participated. There were also two instances where respondents returned their completed questionnaires but had removed the identification number. Another altered his number. They were identified through demographic data so they could be checked off the control list. Their attitude was one of cooperation but accompanied by a desire to remove any possibility for personal reprisal. None of them held any unusual views.

Of negative impact is the impersonal mailing address. In cases where organizations are selected as respondents the researcher might

more profitably substitute with addresses of named individuals. Although only a few of these organizational respondents were selected for this study, none of them participated. A similar complication results from membership or mailing lists where the population is shifting or growing rapidly. As indicated earlier, only six initially selected respondents were lost owing to incorrect mailing addresses. During the course of the study another half dozen participants moved and could not be reached with follow-up letters or short forms, though they had received the long form. In the fall of 1970, IAD launched a vigorous membership campaign and almost doubled its total following over the 4,000 subscribers of the spring sampling period. Presumably these new members are not significantly different from those who participated in this survey, but that is only a speculative opinion.

Specific problems which arose out of the administration and coding of the questionnaires included general respondent distaste for hypothetical questions (#7 and #8 in particular). Some participants also criticized the content of the attitudinal items but very few of them altered the statements (#9). Such reactions may be a reflection of the generally high education of the respondents, a factor which also may have contributed to the favorable response rate.

Open-ended questions on political activity proved to be somewhat inadequate (#19). Though they had the opportunity, respondents did not provide consistent or detailed information and answers often were difficult to interpret. A more structured set of questions on the same

material might have overcome this, but would have lengthened the questionnaire as well. Enough data was gathered by political behavior items, however, to apply a "hierarchy of political involvement" structure in subsequent data analysis, as the next chapter will indicate.⁵⁴ Though a social participation scale-type of analysis was suggested for analyzing this data, the proposal was made after the questionnaire had been mailed and questions had not been included to make this type of assessment possible.⁵⁵ Such an analytical scale might be important, however, in such future research.

One question failed to yield any useful information (#24b). The item repeatedly was misunderstood or ignored as inapplicable or confusing. Also, in preparing the short form of the questionnaire, a response option to indicate race inadvertently was omitted (#54). Respondents using the long form overwhelmingly proved to be white but some participants did indicate some resentment at being asked this question. It may be that the small number of respondents using the short form did not differ significantly in racial composition from those using the long form, but the error still limits the actual totals.

In conclusion, it should be noted that some of the data gathered will not be utilized or analyzed at this time. A large amount of information was obtained, coded, and stored on IBM sort cards. Because

⁵⁴See Milbrath, op. cit., p. 18.

⁵⁵See Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement (New York: David McKay Company, 1964), pp. 208-216.

this is mainly a descriptive study, a significant amount of the data will appear over and above the information required by the stated hypotheses. Secondary analyses will explore certain of the findings which are not of concern to the immediate hypotheses. Thus, the close reader of the questionnaire is advised that not all of the information gathered need appear in this report. In the following chapter data central to the hypotheses is presented and analyzed together with other relevant findings.

CHAPTER III

CHARACTERISTICS AND ATTITUDES OF ANTI-EXTREMISTS

The task of describing a surveyed population presents no difficulty if the intention is simply to create an image of that collectivity in isolation or point out how it differs from the national citizenry as portrayed in the latest census. The more significant analysis results from comparisons among populations which bear some relationship to one another.

I. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF IAD MEMBERS

The Institute for American Democracy is a loosely knit anti-extremist organization. Presumably, those who join IAD do so to obtain more information about their foe and for involvement in concerted actions to halt the advance of that foe. While it is difficult to determine who these members felt constituted the enemy when they first enrolled in the ranks of IAD, they soon came to recognize the Institute opposed both the extreme left and extreme right, but devoted considerable attention to only one of these. Respondents were asked where they thought "the emphasis of IAD's anti-extremism is chiefly directed (question #31)." The majority of those responding indicated they perceived this

emphasis to be upon the American right-wing while another large number said the Institute's interest in extremists included both the left and the right. Though IAD has expressed views on the Black Panthers, Robert F. Williams, and the reparations cause of James Forman, few respondents felt black nationalist movements were included in the Institute's anti-extremism (see Table I).

TABLE I
MEMBERSHIP PERCEPTION OF EMPHASIS
OF IAD'S ANTI-EXTREMISM

the extreme right	45.5%
the extreme left	.5
black nationalists	0.0
both left and right	37.0
left, right and black nationalists	7.0
DK	4.0
NA	6.0
n = 259	

Identifying Bias:

Indeed, when asked in an open-ended question if they thought IAD's newsletter, Homefront, "shows any particular bias (question #29d), " a quarter of those who claimed to read the publication (n = 248) indicated they felt it was favorably biased toward the left. This did not mean that Homefront was radical or subversive but, rather, that it portrayed all but the most extreme left-wing groups in a beneficial

manner, a practice not extended to right-wing counterparts. Very few of these respondents characterized the newsletter in any other way, except to say it was unbiased (see Table II).

TABLE II
MEMBERSHIP PERCEPTION OF HOMEFRONT BIAS

toward the left	25%
not dispassionate enough	4
pro-democratic	5
no bias	43
middle ground position	1
other characterizations	1
DK	1
NA	20
n - 248	

Attempting to explore the question of bias further, a content analysis was undertaken, probing the information contained in the first four volumes of IAD's newsletter. The Homefront layout consists of two different width columns, running either three 14-pica columns or two 21 1/2-pica columns to the page. Lines of print in each of these columns were then counted into three categories: (1) stories on the right-wing, (2) stories on the left-wing, and (3) house information such as book reviews, news notes on local committee activities, internal organization news, and any information which could not fairly be said to fall in either of the first two categories. Included in the left-wing content were stories dealing with black nationalist groups and the peace movement. The first

two newsletters in 1967, largely promotional in nature, contained only house information and were, therefore, not included in the left-right analysis. The overall purpose of the research on Homefront was to determine the extent of space IAD devoted to the two ideological fringes, thereby reflecting its emphasis in perceiving and combatting extremism. The results indicated an overwhelming bias toward portraying the activities of the far right (see Table III).

TABLE III
LINES OF PRINT ON LEFT-WING AND RIGHT-WING
ACTIVITY AS REPORTED IN HOMEFRONT

Volume:	2 column page		3 column page	
	Right	Left	Right	Left
I (1967) - 6 issues	1678	134	650	36
II (1968) - 9 issues	2656	331	2182	205
III (1969) - 10 issues	2443	578	4119	315
IV (1970) - 10 issues	1521	856	4372	371

The content of Homefront tends to confirm the impressions of the membership regarding a special emphasis on the American right-wing as extremists. As one additional test of these impressions, respondents were asked to rate a series of organizations which represented a variety of ideological perspectives in American politics. The attempt with this device was to determine if IAD literature enabled respondents to recognize these groups as "good" or "bad," and also to simultaneously assess to what extent the rating assigned to these

organizations by the IAD membership coincided with the Institute's official view of them. This question appeared only on the long form (n = 241) of the questionnaire (see Table IV).

Generally, IAD members registered distaste for all of the right-wing groups and certain of the obvious radical left organizations such as Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Black Panthers. A notable exception, however, was the equal amount of "like" and "dislike" assessments of the Progressive Labor Party, a Maoist faction of the New Left. Almost half of those responding could not identify PLP, also an interesting indication of under emphasis by IAD of an "enemy." PLP is always included in the Institute's survey of extremists of the left and has received extensive treatment in at least one issue of Homefront. In this regard, a fifth of those responding could not identify the Sex Education Information Council (SEICUS), a group with which IAD is allied in counterattacking right-wing assaults on sex education curricula in the public schools. An amazing number of respondents could not identify the American Security Council, a right-wing organization to which Homefront has given extensive coverage. Notable too are the equal number of "like" and "strongly dislike" views of the American Farm Bureau, a highly conservative agriculture association, but a group to which IAD has given almost no attention. While members may read the Institute's newsletter, they apparently do not retain any lasting impression of the groups examined there.

What emerges from these findings is that the average IAD member

TABLE IV

RATING OF OTHER POLITICAL GROUPS BY IAD MEMBERS

Groups:	Strongly dislike	Dislike	NA	Like	Strongly like	DK
N. A. A. C. P.	1%	2%	4%	31%	62%	0%
Am. Civil Liberties Union	4	3	7	27	58	1
S. D. S.	38	30	20	8	2	3
C. O. R. E.	6	13	27	38	11	5
Sex Ed. Info. Council	1	0	14	28	37	20
Chamber of Commerce	7	23	49	14	4	3
National Farmers Union	4	8	29	17	4	38
Black Panthers	34	26	25	13	2	0
Americans for Const'l Action	22	11	10	1	1	55
Unitarians	1	2	29	34	31	3
American Jewish Committee	0	2	16	32	15	35
Liberty Lobby	69	10	4	1	1	15
Nat. Assoc. of Manufacturers	16	36	33	6	0	9
United Auto Workers	2	6	30	46	14	2
American Legion	31	42	19	7	1	0
Nat. Right-to-Work Comm.	30	18	17	6	3	26
Sierra Club	0	2	9	21	42	26
League for Industrial Demo.	2	2	7	9	11	69
Americans for Demo. Action	3	4	11	31	41	10
Progressive Labor Party	11	9	23	9	2	46
Farm Bureau Federation	12	16	22	11	2	37
S. A. N. E.	2	2	14	24	35	23
Young Americans for Freedom	28	18	12	4	2	36
American Security Council	30	12	7	4	0	47
n = 231						

84

probably considers himself a "liberal" or "moderate-liberal" who, upon joining IAD, accepts the official Institute designation of enemies as being right-wing groups in general and the more radical elements of the left, including black nationalists. Those who read Homefront, recognizing its emphasis and bias, generally felt it was consistent with their own views. (See Table V).

TABLE V

HOMEFRONT COMPARED BY IAD MEMBERS
WITH OTHER INFORMATION SOURCES

Closer to your own opinions	33%) -70%
Equally close to your opinions	37)
Less close to your own opinions	3	
DK	7	
NA	18	
n = 248		

Identifying Extremism:

When called upon to provide some personal understanding of the term "extremism," three-quarters of the respondents chose to provide abstract definitions which made no reference to the ideology of either the left or the right. It may have been implied but was not included in their written responses. These varied criteria apparently serve to distinguish extremists in the minds of the IAD membership (see Table VI).

TABLE VI
EXTREMISM DEFINED BY IAD MEMBERS

to go to extremes in thought and/or action	27%
refusal to acknowledge opposing views have any merit or to be absolutistic	23
violent assertion of ideological views	8
irrational judgment and/or opinions	8
exercise of anti-democratic authority	3
use of any means to secure desired end	3
denial of constitutional rights	3
DK	0
NA	25
n = 259	

Some of these responses define extremism in terms of habits of thought; others, of action; and still others, of both forms of behavior. At least one characterization--"exercise of anti-democratic authority"--would seem to limit extremism to public or private officials having some degree of power over public affairs. None of the definitions necessarily defends the status quo and all could be applied to either side of the ideological spectrum. It should be added that the language used by respondents in the open-ended question (question #30) created no problems of intention when responses were coded and entered into the categories recorded in Table VI. Only one respondent clearly stated he did not know what the term meant while a quarter of the participants provided no answer. Thus, most of those who consider themselves members of IAD and "anti-extremists" believe they know what they are opposed to in both theoretical and concrete terms.

II. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Recognizing IAD's official emphasis upon the American right generally and the ultra left in particular as the enemy, a variety of demographic data has been extracted from studies of these ideologues in an attempt to make the comparable characteristics of IAD members more meaningful. Data of a fairly recent nature was drawn from a study of moderate New York Republicans and philosophically doctrinaire members of the Conservative Party of that state.¹ Additional material came from a 1962 study of the predominantly Protestant and all-white Christian Anti-Communism Crusade.² Information included in this study of the CACC was drawn almost exclusively from a native California population and both it and the New York study utilized a non-systematic selection process to obtain participants. Similarly, a 1965 study of so-called "radical rightists" in the Pacific Northwest region of the United States also provided some comparative data.³ Respondents for

¹Robert A. Schoenberger, "Conservatives and Conservatism: A Study of the Attitudes and Characteristics of Conservative and Republican Party Members" (unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York, 1967).

²Raymond E. Wolfinger, et. al., "The Clientele of the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade," a paper prepared for the 1963 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Commodore Hotel, New York, New York (1963); a revised version appears in David E. Apter, (ed.), Ideology and Discontent (New York: Free Press, 1964), pp. 262-293.

³Ira Rohter, "Radical Rightists: An Empirical Study" (unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1967).

this research were also selected by a non-systematic process.

Finally, a national sample of John Birch Society members afforded useful data. This material came from a 1965 study based upon a membership sample selected by the Society itself.⁴

A survey of the literature soon revealed that almost no similar studies are available on ultra leftists, at least none providing useful comparative demographic data. The only useful material of this type came from an old survey of American, British, French and Italian ex-Communists which was undertaken in 1950-1951.⁵ In addition to being of early vintage, the information could not always be isolated in terms of nationality groups. When data on American ex-Communists was available, it received the designation "CPUSA" in comparison tables. Otherwise it was identified simply as "Communists." It should also be noted that in comparing vocational backgrounds, the ex-Communists were identified according to positions they held at the time of entering the party. Membership in the party often cost these individuals their jobs either because they became Communist officials or organizers or because their association with the party resulted in their being fired.

⁴Frederick William Grupp, Jr., "Social Correlates of Political Activists: The John Birch Society and the ADA" (unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1968).

⁵Gabriel Almond, The Appeals of Communism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954).

In assessing the significance of religion and ideology, comparative information on this relationship was drawn from a 1964 study of the beliefs of a national sample of the American public.⁶ This material is discussed and included in the analysis of religious preferences of IAD members.

Incidence of First Generation Americans:

As indicated earlier, persons having parents born outside of the United States can be considered first generation Americans who are thought to be more aware of their country's ideals than citizens whose parents were born and raised in the United States.⁷ Although there is no data available on the extent to which these first generation Americans generally participate in political organizations, it is not surprising that a little over a quarter of the membership of a pro-democratic/anti-

⁶Lloyd A. Free and Hadley Cantril, The Political Beliefs of Americans (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968).

⁷Research by Edgar Litt suggests first generation Americans are indoctrinated with an idealized view of American government and democracy in educational courses required for naturalization and obtain this heightened sensitivity through this process. Gerhard Lenski, however, claims his research findings in the Detroit Area Study indicate the first generation American clings to folkways and customs of the "old country" and it is the third generation which becomes thoroughly indoctrinated to American ideals and practices. Lenski's findings are not, however, directly relevant to the matter of political values and the idealization of democracy and Litt presents the better substantiated conclusion. See Gerhard Lenski, The Religious Factor (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1961), pp. 40-50, 295-297, 326-330; Edgar Litt, "Civic Education, Community Norms, and Political Indoctrination," American Sociological Review, XXVIII (February, 1963), 69-75.

extremist group should be of foreign born parentage. Such individuals might be said not only to cherish the principles of the country but to be willing to participate in an organized effort to safeguard and defend those values as well. By comparison, the presence of these same types of people in groups of the ideological extremes can also be explained. The CACC not only has a strong religious (sectarian) appeal, but has often been characterized as a "super-patriotic" organization. A man of strong religious conviction and vehemently opposed to Communism could easily join a group like the CACC. On the other hand, those joining the Communist party might be explained as extreme cynics who, after being socialized to the ideals of the American system, discovered some discrepancy between principle and practice, a disparity necessitating radical correction and, for them, Communism seemed to offer the necessary reform. These explanations for the presence of first generation Americans in ultra left, middle, and far right organizations are both partial and theoretical. They do, however, point up the general appeal of each type of group for the individual. Indeed, as Almond's study of ex-Communists demonstrates, it is the particular individual's circumstances which affect his choice of ideological organization and, subsequently, his political enemy. It can be concluded here, however, only that all three types of cause are apparently particularly appealing to the first generation American. (See Table VII).

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF IAD MEMBERS AND LEFT/RIGHT
IDEOLOGUES BY PARENTAL BIRTHPLACE

Birthplace:	IAD	CPUSA	CACC
American born	59%	20%	67%
Foreign born	27	35	28
NA/DK	14	45	5
n =	259	64	283

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON OF IAD MEMBERS AND LEFT/RIGHT
IDEOLOGUES BY SEX IDENTIFICATION

Sex:	IAD	CPUSA	RR
Male	67%	83%	87%
Female	31	17	9
NA/DK	2	0	43
n =	259	64	168

TABLE IX

COMPARISON OF IAD MEMBERS, NEW YORK REPUBLICANS
AND RIGHTISTS BY RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE

Religion:	IAD	NYRP	NYCP	RR
Protestant	52%	62%	43%	85%
Catholic	4	27	36	8
Jewish	18	4	0	} -7
Other	12	2	11	
None	12	4	11	0
NA/DK	2	0	0	0
n =	259	48	45	169

Sexual Identification:

An examination of the comparative distribution of ideological organization supporters by sex seems to indicate more women and slightly fewer men are active in an anti-extremist cause than there are in either an ultra left or ultra right cause. One explanation for the greater number of women members in IAD might lie in the nature of the Institute's demands on its supporters. Both the Communist and the radical rightist must attend meetings, make personal contacts, infiltrate other organizations or, in brief, engage in activities outside of his home. The IAD member, on the other hand, reads his newsletter for current national extremist activity information, scrutinizes his local paper, writes an occasional public letter to a newspaper or magazine, but generally remains at home. Respondents revealed seventy-two percent of those participating in this study were married and, counting those widowed, divorced or separated as well, eighty-four percent of those participating had one or more children. Thus, the women with family obligations could easily participate in IAD while remaining at home (see Table VIII).

Religious Identification:

In comparing supporters by religion, no useful data could be obtained on Communists. It should also be noted that researchers studying the CACC reported "slightly more than three-quarters of the Crusaders are Protestants. Only 8% are Catholics. . ."⁸ Comparative

⁸Wolfinger, op. cit., p. 7.

information was developed, however, on three different gradated groups of the right-wing. This data (see Table IX) can also be discussed in comparison with ideological trends revealed by a national sample of Americans (see Tables X and XI).⁹ This latter group responded to two different measures of ideology, one containing statements of philosophic principle and one composed of statements of public policy. The differences between these measures (shown in Table XII) led the authors to conclude that while ideological conformity exists at the policy level, a strong incidence of conservatism at the philosophic level "indicates that the liberal trend of policies and programs that has characterized the American scene much of the time since the early days of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal has little secure underlying foundation in any ideological consensus."¹⁰

The incidence of Protestants belonging to IAD falls between the percentages of the New York Republican sample and the Conservative Party population. This, together with the indications reflected by the national survey information, might suggest these Protestant members of the Institute constitute a potential conservative influence in the organization. A more plausible explanation for the high number of Protestants derives from the Institute's non-sectarian identification of the

⁹Material for Table XI taken from Free and Cantril, op. cit., pp. 148-149.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 39.

TABLE X

IDEOLOGICAL ORIENTATION OF AMERICANS BY RELIGION:
MEASURED BY STATEMENTS OF PHILOSOPHIC PRINCIPLE

	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish
Liberal	14%	17%	44%
Middle	28	48	39
Predominantly Con.	21 } -58%	18 } -35%	10 } -17%
Completely Con.	37 }	17 }	7 }
Total n = 1491			

TABLE XI

IDEOLOGICAL ORIENTATION OF AMERICANS BY RELIGION:
MEASURED BY STATEMENTS OF PUBLIC POLICY

	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish
Liberal	60%	77%	90%
Middle	22	17	7
Predominantly Con.	9 } -18%	3 } -6%	0 } -3%
Completely Con.	9 }	3 }	3 }
Total n = 3041			

TABLE XII

IDEOLOGICAL ORIENTATION OF AMERICANS BY RELIGION:
MEASURED BY STATEMENTS OF PHILOSOPHIC PRINCIPLE
AND PUBLIC POLICY COMPARED

	Principle	Policy
Liberal	16%	65%
Middle	34	21
Predominantly Con.	20 } -50%	7 } -14%
Completely Con.	30 }	7 }

enemies of democracy. When asked to what extent they agreed with the statement, "The principles of IAD are similar to the social theology principles of my religion," slightly more than sixty percent of the sample (n = 231) indicated agreement (question #33). Responses were as follows:

TABLE XIII

COMPARISON OF IAD AND RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES
BY INSTITUTE MEMBERS

agree strongly	38%
agree but not very strongly	23
disagree strongly	3
disagree but not very strongly	4
DK (including non-religionists)	22
NA	10
n = 231	

While a majority of the IAD members feel some similarity exists between the Institute's principles and the social theology of their religion, regardless of the individual's preferred faith, Catholics and Jews, which have been persecuted religions in America, might join a pro-democratic organization designed to specifically deal with religious bigots rather than "extremists" in general. The fact that Protestants have not been so persecuted explains why there are no such specialized groups for them for counteracting prejudice against them and, in addition, they do not feel the need to single out a particular type of religious bigot but commit themselves, instead, to the Institute's efforts at opposing extremists in general. The significance of non-sectarianism is further

discussed later in this chapter.

The IAD membership, compared with the right-wing populations, loses its conservative potential when the higher Jewish quotient is considered. In the national survey study Jews indicated, by either measure utilized, the highest incidence of liberalism of all three religions. And, when IAD members are further compared with New York Republicans, the possibility of conservative influence again drops due to the greater number of less orthodox "other" religions as well as the higher frequency of non-religionists. With the New York Conservatives, on the other hand, their potential for more conservatism could result from the greater Catholic quotient. Such party leaders as Daniel Mahoney, Kieran O'Doherty, William F. Buckley, Jr., and now Senator James L. Buckley (C/R-N. Y.), all Catholics, may not only reflect the ideological outlook of party members of the same faith, but might serve to indicate the type of highly orthodox Catholic who is attracted to this particular political entity.¹¹ Certainly the Protestants of the "radical right" would be of the more

¹¹The principles involved in the formation and leadership of the Conservative Party are discussed in J. Daniel Mahoney, Actions Speak Louder (New Rochelle: Arlington House, 1968); the Buckleys are currently very active in opposing legalized abortion with L. Brent Bozell, a Buckley brother-in-law, leading the assault through the pages of Triumph, a conservative Catholic monthly which he edits, and the Sons of Thunder, a militant youth oriented protest group. He was arrested recently (Washington Post, September 12, 1970) for protest actions at a Washington, D. C., hospital and his wife gained notoriety for physically attacking a feminist speaker at Catholic University (Washington Post, March 11, 1971).

fundamentalist variety. These sects often hold religious views which indicate a high coincidence of bias comparable to the outlook of ultra right politicians.¹² By comparison with other conservative groups, the presence of strong minorities of other liberalizing factions--Jews, less orthodox religions and non-religionists--offsets the IAD membership's potential for conservatism.

In conclusion, it should be noted that what is actually being recognized here in this discussion is ideological identity rather than influence. IAD's policies and positions on public issues are determined by its leaders with almost no input from the supporters. In brief, liberal Protestants may be interested in the Institute, just as conservative Catholics are thought to be interested in the New York Conservative Party, because of the particular program each group has adopted. If the platform shifted, to the distaste of the Protestants or any of the minority factions, they would have little recourse but withdrawal. The point is, however, that Protestants have joined, in large numbers, have remained, and have a particular reason for doing so--not only because they may perceive a connection between their theological outlook and IAD's anti-extremism, but it would seem that the non-sectarian nature of the Institute as well as the presence of high Protestant churchmen in

¹²On this comparison see Alan F. Westin, "The John Birch Society," in Daniel Bell, (ed.), The Radical Right (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1963), p. 203.

its leadership structure has contributed to their interest. Two of IAD's three national chairmen have been Methodist clergymen and several other theologians and ministers of the Protestant faiths have served on the board of sponsors. Representation has been determined according to denominations rather than by faiths. Catholic and Jewish leaders are present but not in equal proportion to the combined Protestant total. Lacking any special civil right/civil liberties vehicle which is peculiarly their own, Protestant leaders and laymen may be interested in IAD for this reason.¹³

Age Identification:

While data from other studies of ideologues allows only approximate comparisons of populations by age, the significant factor evolving from an examination of Institute members concerns the lack of supporters under twenty-five years of age. Indeed, age appears to be distributed in a normal curve in the IAD sample with a slight bias toward more elderly members. This preponderance of older supporters may result from the peculiar kind of activism required of the Institute's members. Theirs is a rather introspective type of politics of watching and waiting for the extremist advance. While the same may be said of the radical rightists who search for subversives, their hunt is an offensive action

¹³ Nineteen percent of the sample (n = 259) indicated they were a clergyman by profession, were married to ministers, or their fathers had been clergymen.

which requires meetings with allies and taking direction action to ferret out the foe. Perhaps for these reasons they also count a number of young supporters, attracted by the activism and personal interaction of right-wing organizations. It might also be suggested, though no comparable evidence is available to support the contention, that older Americans, having experienced such national catastrophes as the Great Depression, World War II, the Cold War and related Korean conflict, might be more interested in a pro-democratic/anti-extremist organization like IAD than young political activists who are cynical about the system, democracy, and determinations of who is extreme and why. Certainly the older IAD members are no less interested in the Vietnam conflict, political repression, and freedom of expression than young people are today. Members' views on current issues will be examined later. The difference between the relatively older Institute supporter and the equally concerned youth may be that the IAD member thinks he has found a mechanism to combat evils while young Americans are, often in desperation, still searching. For the moment, however, youth does not seem interested in an organization like the Institute, and may not even know of its existence (see Table XIV).

Educational Identification:

An outstanding factor among all of the membership political groups considered comparatively here (not the New York Republicans) is the high educational level of their members. The number of those

TABLE XIV

COMPARISON OF IAD MEMBERS, NEW YORK REPUBLICANS,
AND RIGHTISTS BY AGE DISTRIBUTIONS

	IAD	NYRP	NYCP	RR	CACC	JBS
less/21	0%					
21-24	1	21-29	8%	20-35	20-49	52%
25-34	13	30-39	15	47		less/30 20%
35-44	20	40-49	23	16	36-45	30-39 29
45-54	24	50-59	25	2	46-55	40-49 24
55-64	19	60/more	29	2	56-65	50-59 13
65-74	14				66/more	60-69 10
75/more	6					70/more 4
NA/DK	3	0	0	0	3	1
n =	259	48	45	163	308	650

who hold a college degree (see Table XV) is in inverse proportion to the degree of political extremism thought to be demonstrated by each rightist group: the conservative NYCP with sixty-two percent, the far right CACC with fifty-two percent, and the ultra right JBS with thirty percent. The ultra left Communist sample, contaminated with Europeans and counting "some college" respondents as well as college graduates, exceeds its rightist counterpart by ten percent but still falls short of the far right CACC in the number of college educated members. IAD, by comparison, counts seventy-nine percent of its supporters in this category.

The incidence of higher education among the memberships of these ideological groups suggests that those who know more about the political world are more likely to feel they can do something to manipulate it. Thus, they organize to maximize their individual desires.¹⁴ But education also has an effect upon rationality and reason. Knowing how the political world functions reveals both the possible and the impossible to the educated man. When his policy preferences are defeated, he may seek their implementation in another governmental arena or seek to replace the policymakers responsible for the loss. In brief, the educated citizen presses his demands within the governmental system and with defeat he does not seek to destroy that system or resort to conspiracy theories when experiencing such a loss. Thus, few highly

¹⁴ Other studies supporting this view are discussed in Lester Milbrath, Political Participation (Chicago: Rand McNally Co., 1965), pp. 57-58.

TABLE XV

COMPARISON OF IAD MEMBERS AND LEFT/RIGHT
IDEOLOGUES BY EDUCATION

	IAD	NYRP	NYCP	CACC	JBS	Communists (U.S. & Eur.
Some Grammar School	0%)))))
))) - 3%) - 4%) - 30%
Grammar School Grad.	1%) - 12%) - 0%)))
))			
Some High School	1))	5	7)
))) - 28
High School Graduate	2	19	4	11	24)
Some College	16	21	27	26	33)
)
College Graduate	12	17	31	52	30)
) - 40
Some Post Grad. Ed.	14))	--	--)
) - 4) - 31)
Post Grad. Degree(s)	53))	--	--)
NA/DK	1	0	0	3	1	2
n =	259	48	45	308	650	221

educated individuals cannot, for example, accept the international Communist conspiracy explanation for American policy failures offered by the John Birch Society. The educated citizen knows that his political views and associations may be kept private but do not have to be secret, as the Society directs. By contrast, IAD attracts those who not only know of the functioning of the political world but agree with the Institute's belief in maintaining a democratic polity characterized by a large amount of individual freedom and equal possibilities for public participation. Education provides not only a better understanding of the political world but seems to instill, as well, an appreciation for the democratic order, an appreciation which the ideological extremes, characterized by less highly educated members, do not hold.

Occupational Identification:

The most notable factor apparent in the educational background of IAD members derives from the observation that over half of the sample holds advanced degrees. It is not surprising, therefore, that a large majority of these supporters hold occupations in the professions. Among these, the somewhat sophisticated and intellectual approach of the Institute to politics may have special appeal. Cutting across partisanship, geography, and the traditional policy arenas, IAD asks its supporters to assess the operating philosophies and ideologies of a number of individuals, organizations, and publications. Oftentimes these subjects of attention have no relationship to current governmental

or economic issues. The first task is to identify the enemy, to know what he stands for, and be aware of his presence. The total effort represents a kind of juggling act of multiplying ideological entities. It has no beginning and no end. Just when the activities of these enemies seem trivial, unreal, and otherwise without effect, IAD demonstrates how they have at some point entered the mainstream of American politics, attacked decent citizens and threatened havoc for a segment of the democratic system. While all of this is a good show, containing both comedy and tragedy, whom does it interest? Who has the time and the intelligence to stay with it? The professional man not only follows this kind of drama because it interests him, but he soon realizes that certain of the targets of these extremists include him and his causes. A quick survey of the extremist's own literature indicates his interest in schools and churches as subjects for assault.¹⁵ Fringe groups would destroy these institutions or capture them for their own use as instruments of public influence.

Of interest at this point too is the respondent reaction to the extremist attack on the organized labor movement. Several national brotherhoods as well as the AFL-CIO combine contribute to and otherwise support IAD. Lately, however, certain unions have, out of distaste for radical leftist protests, exhibited strong conservatism through "Hard Hat" parades and "America, Love it or Leave it" slogans. When

¹⁵It is notable that nineteen percent of the Institute's supporters indicated either that they were themselves a clergyman, were married to a clergyman, or their father was a minister. Similarly, thirty-one percent indicated they were a teacher or their father had been a teacher.

IAD members were asked to react to the statement "IAD and the organized labor (union) movement stand for the same goals, " the following results were obtained:

TABLE XVI
COMPARISON OF IAD AND UNION GOALS BY
INSTITUTE MEMBERS

agree strongly	3%
agree but not very strongly	19
disagree strongly	13
disagree but not very strongly	20
DK	38
NA	7
n = 231	

A most interesting response was the high percentage of "don't knows, " demonstrating some uncertainty about the goals of unions as compared with those of IAD. The high number of professionally employed Institute members may serve to explain this uncertainty. Not necessarily adverse to organized labor, these professionals are non-union workers and therefore unfamiliar with union policies. Though organized labor has provided financial support for the Institute since its creation, only fourteen percent of the sample (n = 231) belonged to a union.

The type of professionals who are IAD members probably further explains the difference between the Institute's perspective and that of the Conservative Party which also has a high professions membership. Though there is no data to support the suspicion, it is very likely that the NYCP professionals are drawn from such areas as law, medicine,

or business experts in economics, all of which are popularly regarded as being somewhat conservative. The other right-wing populations are fairly evenly distributed over the occupational spectrum while the European contaminants in the Communist sample make conclusions regarding it most difficult. Their comparative data is, nevertheless, included in Tables XVII and XVIII.

Income Identification:

Comparative income data is arranged in categories of close similarity but when gathered in other studies it did not parallel the same categories used in this research on IAD. Even the rough approximations, however, quickly indicate the Institute's members, above the \$15,000-16,000 a year range, are double the number supporting any of the right-wing groups. This is consistent with the high number of professionals belonging to IAD but the information is significant in another regard. An examination of members' contribution patterns indicates very little of this potential wealth is passed on to the Institute. The basic membership fee stands at five dollars. This brings the contributor a year's subscription to Homefront. Data on average contributions to IAD, however, indicate a number of individuals receive the newsletter even though they pay less than the basic fee or nothing! This free allocation of Homefront can be explained by the frequent staff turnover at IAD headquarters and inattention to precise bookkeeping (see Table XIX).

TABLE XVII

IAD MEMBERS AND RIGHTISTS COMPARED BY OCCUPATION

	IAD	NYRP	NYCP	RR	CACC	JBS
Professional	64%	17%	64%	22%	31%	25%
Business/Managerial	4	19	20	17	27	30
Clerical/Sales	9	10	11	15	14	17
Skilled/Semi/Service	8	42	4	25	11	14
Other	9	13	0	21	6	6
NA	6	0	0	0	11	9
n =	259	48	45	112	308	650

TABLE XVIII

IAD MEMBERS AND COMMUNISTS COMPARED BY OCCUPATION

	IAD	Communists
Professional	64%	22%
Large Business Owner	1/2	--
Small Business Owner	2	1
White Collar Worker	9	10
Skilled Manual Worker	2	24
Semi-Skilled Manual	2	--
Unskilled Manual	1/2	13
Farm Owner/Manager	1)
Tenant Farmer	4)-1
Unclassified	9	29
NA	6	0
n =	259	221

TABLE XIX
AVERAGE ANNUAL INSTITUTE CONTRIBUTION
BY IAD MEMBERS

\$20	2%
15	2
10	20
9	2
8	0
7	0
6	0
5	25
0	35
NA/DK	14
n = 259	

While IAD's membership appears to be quite wealthy (see Table XX), most of its supporters are providing only the minimum sum to keep their newsletter coming. Some individuals apparently are willing to accept Homefront without paying for it. What these figures would seem to indicate is that these same Institute members are supporting other causes. Respondents were asked "for the period in which you have contributed to IAD, approximately how much was the contribution of your total annual political contributions?" The

TABLE XX

ANNUAL INCOME OF IAD MEMBERS, NEW YORK REPUBLICANS
AND RIGHTISTS COMPARED

annual income	IAD	annual income	NYRP	NYCP	annual income	CACC	JBS
less than \$5,000	9%	less than \$4,000	6%	0%	less than \$4,000	9%	5%
5,000-9,999	19	4,000-9,999	57	35	4,000-9,999	42	42
10,000-14,999	21	10,000-13,999	21	26	10,000-14,999	20	27
15,000-19,999	14)	14,000-15,999	6	9	15,000 or more	21	22
20,000-24,999	13)	16,000 or more	10	20			
25,000-29,999	7)						
30,000-39,999	4)	-50%					
40,000-49,999	3)						
50,000-99,999	6)						
100,000 or more	3)						
NA/DK	1		0	0		8	5
n =	259		48	45		308	650

following responses were obtained:

TABLE XXI

IAD CONTRIBUTION RELATIVE TO OTHER POLITICAL
CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SAME PERIOD

100% of it	5%
75-99	3
50-74	4
25-49	11
under 25	55
DK	3
NA	19
n = 231	

An attempt was made to determine the extent of competition by other non-party political groups, i.e. organizations generally like IAD, for the Institute supporter's contribution funds. Respondents were asked the number of non-party groups they supported with their gifts (see Table XXII).

TABLE XXII

NUMBER OF GROUPS SUPPORTED BY IAD MEMBERS

none	27%
1 only	21
2 only	12)
3 only	10)
4 only	6) - 34%
5-10	5)
over 10	1)
DK	1
NA	17
n = 231	

Over half of the sample made contributions to at least one other non-party political group and one-third of the respondents were supporting at least two other organizations. It would seem that IAD was probably drawing its supporters from a syndrome of very similar liberal groups in what was apparently a multiple-membership phenomenon. The IAD member made a minimal contribution to the Institute to keep the information forthcoming and then divided the rest of his political funds more generously among similar but more active organizations where he could see what his dollar was "buying" because the groups he aided engaged in a variety of direct performances in different political arenas.

Respondents were asked the names of non-party political groups to which they had contributed while supporting IAD. It is probable that those surveyed did not take time to list every organization and it is also likely they may not have recalled them all. Nevertheless, those listed were identified from a list of organizations from which IAD obtained a collection of mailing or solicitation addresses. The supposition was that these organizations were overworking each other's members. Each group received a small contribution but none obtained a really significant gift.

In addition to probing contributions to interlocking organizations exchanging mailing lists with IAD (listed in Table XXIII), respondents were asked about their memberships in these same groups. Undoubtedly

some participants in the survey equated their membership fee with the term "contribution." This second compilation (listed in Table XXIV) simply reaffirms that which was revealed by the first list.

TABLE XXIII

IAD CONTRIBUTORS TO INTERLOCKING ORGANIZATIONS

Group	Contributors
American Civil Liberties Union	46
Americans for Democratic Action	31
League for Industrial Democracy	3
Southern Christian Leadership Conference	12
SANE	15
United World Federalists	7
Anti-Defamation League	6
National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing	3
Scholarship Education and Defense Fund for Racial Equality	1
Clergy and Layment Concerned About Vietnam	5
National Committee for an Effective Congress	16
United Nations Association	2
Urban League	3
Sex Education Information Council of U. S.	1

TABLE XXIV

IAD MEMBERS OF INTERLOCKING ORGANIZATIONS

Group	Contributors
American Civil Liberties Union	40
Americans for Democratic Action	44
League for Industrial Democracy	2

TABLE XXIV (Continued)

Group	Contributors
Southern Christian Leadership Conference	3
SANE	20
United World Federalists	12
Anti-Defamation League	2
Political Donors of Large Sums	1
Southern Christian Fund	1
Scholarship Education and Defense Fund for Racial Equality	1
Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam	6
Workers Defense League	2
National Sharecroppers Federation	2
National Committee for an Effective Congress	11
United Nations Association	8
Urban League	7
Sex Education Information Council of U. S.	1
Amnesty International	1

In addition to this, about half of the membership makes some type of contribution to a political party and/or a candidate. Respondents were asked to indicate the amount of their average contribution for any one year during the period 1960-1970. The following were the results:

TABLE XXV

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO A PARTY ORGANIZATION
BY IAD MEMBERS

none	43%
\$1-15	19)
16-30	5)
31-50	7) - 47%
51-80	1)
81-100	7)
more than 100	8)
NA	10
n = 231	

TABLE XXVI
ANNUAL CONTRIBUTION TO A CANDIDATE
BY IAD MEMBERS

none	33%
\$1-15	17)
16-30	14)
31-50	3)
51-80	4) - 51%
81-100	5)
more than 100	7)
DK (but gave)	1)
NA	16
n = 231	

It can be generally concluded that IAD members tend to be somewhat wealthy but that only a small portion of their personal income is allocated to political organizations or candidates. This amount is, for any one year, apportioned among the causes which appeal to the individual for support. If, as is the case with IAD members, a number of groups make such a request, the average contribution to any single organization becomes very small. What seems to occur in the case of IAD is that a minimum donation of about five to ten dollars is made, a sufficient sum to bring the contributor a year's subscription to Homefront. The Institute has not, since its beginning, been able to stimulate large contributions by individual members to its budget. While it is not the purpose of this research to determine ways to increase contributions to IAD, a great potential for financial support seems to exist among its current membership. The problem may lie in the fact that these con-

tributors do not realize the research efforts of the Institute require as much revenue as the political action programs of other organizations. IAD's low public visibility also contributes to its receiving minimal funds in that its importance cannot be gauged by the contributorship. In brief, those asked to support IAD are not always certain of what they are buying or what the price tag should be.

III. POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

As noted earlier, the political activities of an individual consist of behavior which is thought to significantly influence the kind of authoritative policy created for society and the manner in which the policy is put into practice. In more concrete terms, the basic political activities of the American citizen center around the electoral arena--voting, campaigning, involvement in party duties. While a man may be a member of a variety of organizations and associations which lobby in his behalf with government, the member remains only indirectly involved in this type of political behavior. What is of interest as political activity in this research is direct personal involvement.

Political Partisanship:

As a non-partisan organization, the ideology of the Institute for American Democracy suggests political activity should be above considerations of party. IAD's Board of Sponsors lists elected representatives belonging to both of the two major parties. In the case of the Institute's

founders, Franklin Littell was a registered Republican, Charles Baker a Democrat. The attempt to demonstrate partisan balance went even further to factions which customarily support one party or the other. Represented on the policy board are both business and labor leaders, all of the major religious denominations, and Negro and Jewish civil rights groups. Because the ideology of IAD was thought to be mirrored by individuals belonging to the organization, it was hypothesized that the political activities of the membership of an anti-extremist organization like the Institute reflect the political ideology of that group. The extent of partisan political activities was first investigated.

As initial indicators of partisanship, respondents were asked their general impression of how, "during the past ten years, in voting for candidates for Congress, for statewide offices, and for President, would you say your votes were." Given six options for answers to this question, the following results were obtained:

TABLE XXVII

SELF-EVALUATED VOTING TREND FOR LAST
TEN YEARS BY IAD MEMBERS

All or mostly Republican	3%
Split but more Republican than Democratic	10
Split evenly	3
Split but more Democratic than Republican	42
All or mostly Democratic	38
Other	1
DK	0
NA	3
n = 259	

By this measure, there emerges a strong tendency to split votes; if any party preference is obvious, however, the Democrats hold the more favored position.

When asked, regardless of voting behavior, "how have you usually thought of yourself--as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what," the following pattern emerged:

TABLE XXVIII
SELF-SELECTED PARTISAN LABEL
OF IAD MEMBERS

Democrat	49%
Republican	11
Independent	37
Other	1
DK	0
NA	2
n = 259	

At first examination it would appear that Democrats outnumber Republicans by about four to one (see Table XVIII). However, the question of commitment arises. Are these doctrinaire party members or individuals who feel some family or vocational tie to a particular partisan label? When those who indicated a preference for either party were asked if they considered themselves a strong party supporter or not, only thirty-eight percent thought they were "strong" partisans while sixty-one percent classified themselves as "not so strong." In addition, those who said they were independents also had an opportunity to indicate if they "leaned" toward one party or another. Of these, seventy-seven

percent "leaned Democratic" while thirteen percent "leaned Republican." Adjusting these preferences to obtain some measure of partisan commitment, seventy-eight percent of the sample (n = 259) supported the Democrats and thirteen percent supported the Republicans. Thus, in terms of partisanship, a definite preference for the Democratic party seems to prevail among IAD members with very few favoring the Republicans. Though a large number of Independents can be found among the Institute's membership, these individuals also indicate strong preference for the Democrats, further contributing to the trend.

Political Participation:

Although the tendency to prefer Democratic partisan politics is apparent among IAD members, to what extent are they actually active? A few years ago Lester Milbrath undertook a broad survey of studies concerning political participation. From his examination of this literature Milbrath set forth a hierarchy of political involvement, an ordered arrangement of political activities which excludes all but a small number of public office holders at its uppermost reaches but includes every voter at its base.¹⁶ This hierarchy was selected for use in assessing the extent of involvement in political activities of IAD members (see Table XXIX).

While non-response to certain items in the questionnaire distorts

¹⁶Ibid., p. 18.

TABLE XXIX
HIERARCHY OF POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT
BY IAD MEMBERS

	-public-	(yes 3%	
		(no 91	
8. Held office at least once			
during 1960-1970 period (n = 231)			
	-party-	(yes 6%	
		(no 91	
7. Candidate for public office at least		(yes 6%	
once during 1960-1970 period (n=231)		(no 92	
		(every year 2%	
6. Active party member (1960-1970)	-	(some years 22	
(n = 231)		(never 73	
		(every year 1%	
5. Active in political campaign (1960-	-	(some years 19	
1970) (n = 231)		(never 61	
		(every year 5%	
	-party -	(some years 18	
		(never 43	
4. Contributed to party or candidate			
(1960-1970) (n = 231)		(every year 2%	
	-candidate-	(some years 33	
		(never 33	
		(1 letter only 6%	
		(2 letters 5	
3. Contacted a public official (1960-1970)	-	(3-5 letters 5	
(n = 231)		(6-10 letters 3	
		(over 10 ltrs. 23	
		(none 16	
		(every elec. 33%	
	-local -	(some elec. 10	
		(none 4	
2. Voting during 10 year period (1960-1970)			
(n = 231)		(every elec. 33%	
	-primary-	(some elec. 17	
		(none 12	
1. Exposure to political stimuli - read <u>Homefront</u>		90%	(n = 259)

the findings here somewhat, it can be generally said that between forty and fifty percent of the IAD members participate in what Milbrath calls "spectator activities" and about eight percent never engage in these actions. From his survey of other studies, Milbrath suggests between forty to seventy percent of the population seems to engage in voting, indicating IAD members are about average at this level of activity.¹⁷ Between one-third and a little more than one-fifth of the IAD sample remains involved, however, as one moves up the hierarchy into "transitional activities" where Milbrath reports from thirteen to fifteen percent are normally found. And at the "gladiatorial" level, about one-fifth of the Institute membership was active in the lower strata of this section while about five percent reached the highest point with candidacies for public office and the actual holding of party or public positions. Milbrath reports only four or five percent usually are involved at the "gladiatorial" level. In brief, IAD members appear to be above average in the extent of their political activities, involving themselves to a greater degree than does a normal sample of the citizenry. It should be noted, as was reported earlier in this chapter (see Table XXII), that IAD members are also involved in a multiplicity of non-party political organizations and causes.

The conclusion to be drawn from these findings does not support the original hypothesis as stated. While the Institute's ideology stresses

¹⁷Comparative data reported in Ibid., p. 19.

non-partisan political activity, a strong party preference was found to exist among the IAD membership. Supporters are, however, quite active in politics, participating to a greater extent than does the general public. The data does sustain the restatement that the above average political participation of members of an anti-extremist organization reflects the political ideology of that group. The Institute has stressed the preservation of the democratic system, safeguarding it from extremists, and keeping it open to exchange and debate. Thus, IAD's ideology conveys the nature and purpose of American politics and the tactics for achieving goals. While it chooses to remain officially non-partisan, its members can and do engage in party politics, mostly favoring the Democrats but many of them also electing to remain "independent." Involved in the political system, these members mirror IAD's commitment to a viable democratic process, providing equal access to all, and reject extreme tactics which hamper or destroy the system.

IV. SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS AND SECTARIANISM

Social characteristics may be generally conceived to include the essential vital statistics of a population. Of particular interest in the case of the Institute for American Democracy are those identifications which indicate sectarianism, i. e. the incidence of some religion or race which might seek to argue its own particular interest. IAD stands as a non-sectarian organization dedicated to opposing extremism. The Institute does not condone racism or religious persecution. In maintaining

and improving democratic practice, the Institute strives for "the greatest good of the greatest number" but not by allowing this utilitarian dictum to obliterate sensitivity to various forms of social, racial, or sexual discrimination which are repugnant to democracy.

As noted in the case of its non-partisanship, IAD has representatives from all of the major religious denominations on its official Board of Sponsors. Leaders from both Negro and Jewish civil rights organizations are included as well. It is the factor of non-sectarianism, however, which distinguishes IAD from close organizational relatives such as these same civil rights groups. IAD describes its foes in ideological terms, calling them extremists, and is aware the enemy can and will strike at any segment of the public. The Institute seeks to protect all from these extremist attacks and does so by making no segment of the population its special concern. Those needing a protector of their particular minority or those desiring to provide security for some such group are not characteristic of the Institute's supporters. Thus, it was hypothesized that the social characteristics of the membership of an anti-extremist organization like IAD reflect the political ideology of that group. In brief, to what extent is the IAD membership non-sectarian?

Racial Sectarianism:

If sectarianism is reflected by the racial composition of a population, then IAD has no minority bias in its composition. When asked what race they considered themselves to be, only three respondents

said they were non-white while ninety-four percent of the sample (n = 231) indicated Caucasian status. As many as a half dozen of the non-respondents (NA = 5%) either placed a question mark after this item or wrote "human", suggesting one's race was irrelevant for membership in IAD. Nevertheless, the issue of civil rights and racial equality ranks as one of the three most important concerns of IAD members. Responses as to the single most important problem currently facing the Nixon administration and Congress were as follows:

TABLE XXX

MOST IMPORTANT CURRENT PROBLEM
PERCEIVED BY IAD MEMBERS

Ending Vietnam conflict	29%
Population control	23
Civil Rights	10
Economic stability	7
Crime control	7
Pollution control	7
Poverty and hunger	5
Public confidence	1
NA	11
n = 231	

While concern over Vietnam and population control was more than twice as great as attention to civil rights matters, interest in racial equality remained high, taking precedence over such matters as pollution and ecology, poverty and hunger, and crime control. In the spring of 1970 when the survey was taken, these latter issues were receiving frequent consideration in the public press and broadcast media and were becoming

popular causes. Still, for IAD members, civil rights remained a subject of high concern. An additional item on Vietnam also has relevance here.

In early September, 1968, the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan asked a national sample of Americans their opinion about protest demonstrations at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago.¹⁸ The item has direct relevance for the matter of political protest in regard to the Vietnam conflict but may have implications for the general question of attempts at peaceful protest, rooted in the civil rights movement, and official public (government) reaction against such demonstrations. The same item was presented to the IAD sample in the spring of 1970, with a slight modification. The statements read:

SRC interview item: "Did you happen to hear anything about what went on between the police and the demonstrators in Chicago at the Democratic convention? (IF YES) Do you think the police used too much force, the right amount of force, or not enough force with the demonstrators?"

IAD mailed questionnaire item: "If you happened to hear about what went on between the police and demonstrators in Chicago at the Democratic convention, do you think the police used too much force, the right amount of force, or not enough force with demonstrators?"

¹⁸See John P. Robinson, "Public Reaction to Political Protest: Chicago 1968," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXIV (Spring, 1970), pp. 1-9.

Responses to each question were as follows:

TABLE XXXI
FORCE USED AGAINST CHICAGO DEMONSTRATORS AS
VIEWED BY IAD MEMBERS AND A NATIONAL
SAMPLE OF AMERICANS

Responses	IAD	SRC
Did not hear about it	1%	12%
Too much force	77	19
Right amount of force	5	32
Not enough force	4	25
DK	7	12
NA	6	0
n =	231	1677

While it is obvious IAD members overwhelmingly disapproved of the force used by police in this particular incident cited by the questions, it may also be generalized that Institute members support the right of peaceful protest, whether the cause be hostility to Vietnam or civil rights demonstrations of the last ten years. In another item respondents were given a situation in which they had to give advice to a student who was offered a needed scholarship to a famous university on the condition that he not become involved in protest demonstrations (question #8). Of the variety of interesting responses to the situation, over one-third of the sample indicated outright that they would advise the student not to sign the agreement and thereby limit his individual freedom. The full range of answers to the situation is produced as follows:

TABLE XXXII

ADVICE TO STUDENT ON AGREEING WHETHER OR
NOT TO ENGAGE IN CAMPUS PROTEST ACTIVITY

Turn down offer, do not sign	36%
Seek a lawyer for advice	4
No advice, let student decide for himself	16
Accept offer, sign	25
Sign, do as you wish when time comes	6
DK	1
NA	12
n = 259	

Religious Sectarianism:

If sectarianism is reflected by the religious composition of a population, then IAD again has no minority bias in its composition. As indicated earlier in this chapter (see Table IX), the Institute counts a small number of Jews among its supporters--whether they be regarded as a race and/or a religion--but also has members who are of no faith and some of unorthodox religious preference.

Although predominantly white and Protestant, IAD maintains a commitment to minority rights and argues no special case for the protection of any particular sect. Opposing extremism, the Institute includes in its targets of opposition both the anti-Semite and the white racist. A few years ago the Anti-Defamation League argued for halting recorded telephone messages being used by a particular right-wing organization. The League contended these communications "defamed"

a minority group in American society, specifically, Jews.¹⁹ ADL equated defamation with libel though the former, often characterized by subtle innuendo and so-called "trick words," remains difficult to substantiate in legal proceedings when damage has to be established. The point is that the League sought to combat extremism by limiting freedom of speech in defamation cases. Such an argument for special protection would seem to go beyond the minority rights redress action available to a persecuted group under established libel law practice. Because ADL has a sectarian bias, it argues special privilege.

IAD members, on the other hand, would not so limit freedom of speech. Asked (question #4e) if they felt the recorded messages of this same right-wing group should be forced off the air and kept off, thirty-eight percent of the sample (n = 231) disagreed strongly while another eighteen percent also opposed such a limitation of speech rights, but less vehemently. On the other hand, only sixteen percent agreed strongly with such removal and eight percent supported the action to a lesser degree. The Institute member is more willing to let a persecuted minority seek redress under existing libel law or civil rights statutes than to argue for further restrictions on guaranteed freedoms. The difference between the ADL view and that of IAD on this matter is one of subtle

¹⁹See Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, Anonymous Use of Automatic Telephone Devices, 89th Congress, First Session (1965), pp. 210-229.

difference but it is a distinction which marks the non-sectarian anti-extremist organization, setting it apart from its sectarian cousins in the field of civil rights. In this regard, IAD is not unsympathetic to minority right issues and defends them when no burden results for the guaranteed freedoms of all. Individuals belonging to certain racial-religious minorities may not be interested in the Institute because of its emphasis upon general freedoms over minority privilege, a stress rooted in IAD's non-sectarianism. Those belonging to the Institute are not, themselves, strongly representative of any minority but still believe in minority rights and the freedom to demonstrate and protest for those rights.

V. POLITICAL AND SOCIAL ATTITUDES OF IAD MEMBERS

If an organization like the Institute for American Democracy stands for the preservation and protection of democratic practices, constitutionally guaranteed freedoms, and open political debate and exchange, the membership should seemingly hold outlooks which are consistent with this perspective. Such an official ideology conveys beliefs regarding the meaning and basis of politics, indicating men are basically cooperative and trustworthy. The IAD member can, conceivably, work with others of like opinion in protecting democracy from extremist attacks. He can rely upon public officials to aid him in exposing the despoilers. The Institute's strong emphasis upon investigation and

exposure seems to suggest that the American citizen, once given the "facts", will rationally and reasonably reject the extremes.

In the related area of values to be maximized through politics, IAD's ideology functions to encourage an open mind. Man is accepted as rational and capable of considering a variety of viewpoints before settling upon a single reasonable conclusion to a problem. Decisions are made without resort to some authority on the topic at hand.

Similarly, in outlining political tactics, the Institute discourages over-reaction to extremists. In defending democracy, members cannot resort to anti-democratic practices. Thus, IAD stresses faith in government leaders, disdains conspiracy theories for explaining extremist behavior, and relies upon public information and, again, individual reason to oppose the enemy. In this regard, it is notable that only a very few Institute members indicated that public confidence in government and elected leaders was a problem with which Congress and the administration had to deal (see Table XXX).

Conversely, IAD members have suggested that extremists do not trust their government or fellow men. Fringe groups are portrayed as close-minded and subject to blindly following the dictates of their revered leaders. Indeed, the anti-Communism programs of many right-wing groups would place multiple restrictions on democratic practice and guaranteed freedoms, the very things which the extremists claim Communism would destroy! The confrontation politics of the radical New Left also is viewed as the utilization of anti-democratic means to

attain a supposedly democratic end.

Because those belonging to IAD would seem to be in agreement with its outlook regarding the meaning and basis of politics, the values to be maximized through political activity, and the tactics to be utilized, it was hypothesized that the social and political attitudes of the membership of an anti-extremist organization like the Institute reflect the political ideology of that group. Certain identified attitude syndromes thought to be theoretically related to IAD's ideology were isolated and items were selected from scales which had been developed to evaluate them.

Incidence of Misanthropy:

The first attitude explored was misanthropy, or the belief that man is, by nature, neither trustworthy nor cooperative. Three items, scored on a four-point scale, were utilized. Respondents had to answer at least two items and almost every participant provided an opinion for every question. The following results were obtained:

TABLE XXXIII
INCIDENCE OF MISANTHROPY AMONG
IAD MEMBERS

Scores	Respondents
1.0 - 2.9	71%
3.0	7
3.1 - 5.0	19
NA	3
n = 231	

Only a little less than one-fifth of the sample scored on misanthropy with the majority of the respondents not reflecting any such attitude. The 3.0 score point was considered the threshold between the misanthropic and the philanthropic individual. Generally, it can be concluded that IAD members view their fellow citizens as cooperative and trustworthy, a view consistent with the Institute's ideology.

Incidence of Dogmatism:

The second attitude explored was dogmatism or close-mindedness, the propensity to consider only one point of view and to hold strongly to that opinion regardless of other persuasive factors. Four items, scored on a four-point scale, were included in the questionnaire. Again, respondents had to answer at least two items and the participation rate remained high. Resulting scores were as follows:

TABLE XXXIV
INCIDENCE OF DOGMATISM AMONG IAD
MEMBERS

Scores	Respondents
1.0 - 2.9	77%
3.0	10
3.1 - 5.0	11
NA	2
n = 231	

Slightly more than one-tenth of the sample scored on dogmatism with the majority of the respondents not reflecting any such attitude.

There were fewer dogmatics than there were misanthropic individuals. The conclusion to be drawn is that IAD members are open to a variety of points of view and are willing to accept alternatives to an adopted opinion if the new outlook is reasonable and well founded. Again, this perspective coincides with the ideology of the Institute.

Incidence of Authoritarianism:

The third attitude considered was authoritarianism or the tendency to seek an ultimate opinion outside of one's own reason and rationality or, when intellectual or social inferiority is assumed in another, the tendency to browbeat or otherwise denigrate that individual. Four items to detect this attitude were inserted in the survey questionnaire and these were again scored on a four-point scale. As in the other cases, respondents had to answer at least two items to qualify as participants in this section of the survey. The response rate remained high with the following results being produced:

TABLE XXXV
INCIDENCE OF AUTHORITARIANISM AMONG
IAD MEMBERS

Scores	Respondents
1.0 - 2.9	58%
3.0	13
3.1 - 5.0	28
NA	1
n = 231	

A little more than one-quarter of the sample scored on authoritarianism with over half of the respondents indicating no such attitude. It is notable, however, that more members reflected an authoritarian attitude than they did dogmatism or misanthropy. There were also fewer non-authoritarians than there were non-dogmatics or philanthropic persons. While scores remained low for a large portion of the IAD membership, leading to the conclusion that this perspective coincides with the Institute's ideology, the relatively high incidence of this attitude might result from the high education and professional status of the membership. What might be reflected by these individuals as an authoritarian outlook is a kind of intellectual elitism and the habit of relying upon certain professional authorities as sources of rarely questioned wisdom. The presence of ministers, theologians, and strong religionists in the sample might also explain this tendency toward authoritarianism. Whatever the reason, it does not alter the general conclusion that the IAD sample does not contain a high number of cases where an authoritarian attitude is held.

Incidence of "Zealousness:"

A final tendency, which cannot be called an attitude in the strict sense of that term, which was considered concerned the condition described as zealousness or willingness to resort to anti-democratic means to defend democratic practices. Nine items were selected to create an index of questions dealing with civil liberties issues, democratic principles,

and IAD policy positions on specific subjects. A four-point scale for scoring was utilized and respondents were required to answer at least four items to be considered as participants. The short questionnaire form included only four questions of relevance for the index but, under this minimum standard, all respondents obtained a score. The results were as follows:

TABLE XXXVI
INCIDENCE OF "ZEALOUSY" AMONG IAD
MEMBERS

Scores	Respondents
1.0 - 2.9	85%
3.0	1
3.1 - 5.0	14
n = 259	

By this index, not even one-fifth of the sample revealed opinions which would place them in the "zealot" category. The vast majority of IAD members demonstrated strong support for the official Institute positions, democratic principles, and individual rights perspective of civil liberties matters posed by these items. In brief, respondents manifested an outlook on these topics which was consistent with the ideology of IAD.

Individuals belonging to the Institute for American Democracy indicate agreement with its ideology regarding the meaning and basis of politics, the values to be maximized through political activity, and the

tactics to be utilized in maintaining democracy in America. These members of IAD are philanthropic, non-dogmatic, non-authoritarian, and not inclined to pursue anti-democratic means to preserve democratic practice. In the cause of combatting extremists these Institute supporters believe their fellow citizens are cooperative and trustworthy and they extend this faith in man to government leaders and public officials as well. Maintaining an open outlook on social and political matters, these individuals are generally willing to rely upon their own reason and rationality to reach decisions regarding issues.

Ideology and Class:

Finally, although ideology has usually been viewed as a dependent variable in social research--following the traditional Marxian concept of ideology as the way of thinking or beliefs of a particular class--it was thought that the non-partisan, non-sectarian, anti-extremist/pro-democracy belief system of the Institute for American Democracy constituted a case where ideology functioned as an independent variable. Therefore, it was hypothesized that the political ideology of an anti-extremist organization, like IAD, attracts group members regardless of their particular demographic characteristics. The demographic properties of particular interest were education level, which is high among IAD members (see Table XV), income level, also high (see Table XX), and age, which in the Institute sample consisted mostly of over-twenty-five year olds (see Table XIV). To test the hypothesis, members were categorized by

income and education, holding age constant. The high concentration of respondents at any single point of the distribution would indicate that characteristics other than a common belief system contributed to the unity of IAD members (see Table XXXVII).

The results obtained indicated a diverse population which shared no common demographic characteristics. Of the participants (n = 259) in the survey, ninety-five percent of these individuals were included in the distribution of particular properties which Institute members seemed to share. While high education may cause the individual member to be more alert to public issues, and willingness to utilize reform procedures and/or counteraction within the governmental and political system may be reflective of the IAD supporter's more mature bearing, these factors do not concentrate within a particular class of individual to create a "typical" Institute member. The ideology of the organization may be a common characteristic shared by these persons but this analysis does not establish that ideology is the unifying property. What has been substantiated is that those belonging to IAD are not homogeneous in terms of age, education, or class (as measured by income level).²⁰ While ideology is seen to be independent of class structure within this group,

²⁰For a discussion of other views of the concept of class and some of the suppositions underlying these considerations see Giovanni Sartori, "From the Sociology of Politics to Political Sociology," in Seymour Martin Lipset, (ed.), Politics and the Social Sciences (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), pp. 70-87.

the extent to which this shared belief system functions as an independent variable has been established in very limited terms in this study. Specifically, while Marx had suggested one's class determined individual "consciousness," this research has found, in terms of IAD members, that their ideological outlook does not, at least, derive from a common class background. With the above limitations recognized, the original hypothesis is better stated by concluding that the political ideology of an anti-extremist organization, like IAD, exists among its members regardless of any particular demographic characteristic whether age, education, or class (income level). To this extent, Scoble's contention that ideology may be regarded as an independent variable, was found to be true.

Data supporting two hypothetical statements has been presented here and two other hypotheses have also been validated but in a restated form. A general conclusion and related considerations are presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

If the essence of politics is, as one observer has suggested, a matter of accommodating groups "so that they each and together can make a positive contribution towards the general business of government, the maintaining of order, " then the function of the anti-extremist organization has importance for all other interest groups in society.¹ Indeed, the Institute for American Democracy bases its activities on the defense of American democracy against the threatening behavior of the ideological fringes of the ultra left and ultra right. Those despoiling or destroying democracy--the accommodation process--by either overt or covert design are singled out for observation and exposure by IAD and are portrayed to the American public as extremists.²

The anti-extremist organization has historically stood apart from partisan politics and argued for the greatest good for the greatest number in a democracy, but has not done so without some regard for

¹Bernard Crick, In Defense of Politics (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1964), p. 18.

²For an argument similar to that of Crick's, cited above, which characterizes the "extremists" as being "anti-political" see John H. Bunzel, Anti-Politics In America (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), especially Chapter 1.

minority rights. Such a perspective points up the non-sectarian nature of this group. It makes no special case for persecuted minorities but attacks any entity engaging in anti-democratic practices. Its foes are extremists, identified in ideological terms, not racists or anti-religionists persecuting a particular sect. The Institute's ideology serves to expand its interest beyond that of a civil rights group serving a particular minority and, because IAD confines its activities to no particular governmental arean, its interest is broader than that of a civil liberties group which confines its activity to the judicial sphere.

For those belonging to the Institute, its ideology specifies the meaning and desirability of politics generally, including one's competence for political roles; the authority, legitimacy, and proper institutional form(s) of government; the values to be stressed through government and political action; and the prescribed strategy and tactics for achieving ends.³ With the exception of a strong partisan bias toward the Democrats, IAD members were seen to generally reflect this ideology. They held a view of extremism which did not necessarily defend the status quo and which could be applied to either side of the ideological spectrum. Few members indicated any difficulty in identifying particular organizations which they thought extreme.

³These ideological convictions compare well with the theory of accommodation for a democracy suggested a short time ago by a normative theorist; see Neal Riemer, The Revival of Democratic Theory (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1962), pp. 100-103.

Most members of the Institute reflected a sense of commitment to a particular party which was not consistent with the non-partisan nature of the organization. But their above average participation in various political activities was in harmony with the ideological conviction that they are competent to participate extensively in politics and that working within established institutions is the most effective way to achieve goals.⁴

In terms of racial and religious identification, IAD members reflect no social characteristics which are inconsistent with the non-sectarian outlook of the organization. Members do, however, consider the minority rights question to be one of the three most important policy matters facing Congress and the President at the present time.⁵ Of related interest is the membership's strong commitment to the right of protest and individual liberty.⁶ If these views are reflective of a liberal outlook on the part of IAD members, then liberals have overcome an unwillingness to oppose totalitarians which one authority believed was characteristic of liberals in the past.⁷ The anti-extremist cause does

⁴See Lester Milbrath, Political Participation (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965), pp. 16-22.

⁵Compare this view with that of a national sample in Lloyd A. Free and Hadley Cantril, The Political Beliefs of Americans (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968), pp. 123-124.

⁶See John P. Robinson, "Public Reaction to Political Protest: Chicago 1968," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXIV (Spring, 1970), 1-9.

⁷See Benjamin E. Lippincott, Democracy's Dilemma (New York: The Ronald Press, 1965).

not sacrifice individual liberty. In fact, IAD members disdained practices in the defense of democracy which were inconsistent with that ideal (non-zealous).

Attitudinally, Institute members viewed their fellow man as cooperative and trustworthy (philanthropic), and as capable of reasonable and rational decisions without resort to some source outside of himself for an ultimate opinion and not prone to browbeating or denigrating assumed intellectual or social inferiors (non-authoritarian); were themselves open-minded (non-dogmatic); and, as already mentioned, refrained from zealous practices in combatting extremism. Not only are these characteristics reflective of good citizens in a democracy, they are the opposites of attitudes thought to be held by extremists. One recent survey of the American right-wing has, for example, found consistent evidence of strong authoritarianism among these ideologues.⁸

Ultimately it was found that those belonging to IAD are not homogeneous in terms of their combined age, education, or class (income level) characteristics. While Marx had suggested one's class determined individual "consciousness," this study concluded that, in terms of IAD supporters, their ideological outlook did not derive from a common class background. Indeed, there does not seem to be a typical Institute member in terms of the three characteristics in question. Of course

⁸Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, The Politics of Unreason (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), pp. 234-235, 478-481.

the concept of class may be defined or operationalized in a variety of ways. In this research income level was selected because of its long-standing use in sociological research and its empirical value. As noted in the previous chapter, some definitions or operationalizations of class may bias research but, nevertheless, the use of income level is common among modern sociologists who view ideology in the Marxist manner.⁹ Care must be taken by those who attempt new understandings of the concept of class that they do not confuse it with the concept of status.

This study supports the contention offered by Harry Scoble, among others, that the Marxist conception of class is not the only one relevant to the study of ideology. Building upon R. M. MacIver's general definition of ideology as the scheme of thinking characteristic of any group, Scoble noted that this view leaves open the cause(s) of ideology and permits it to be treated as an independent variable if doing so serves some research purpose. In his study of the National Committee for an Effective Congress, Scoble specified that ideology concerned perceptions regarding the meaning and desirability of politics, including the individual's competence for participation in such matters; the authority and legitimacy of institutions of government; values to be established through government and politics, though not necessarily limited to specific policy goals; and strategies and tactics thought appropriate for maximizing

⁹See Giovanni Sartori, "From the Sociology of Politics to Political Sociology," in Seymour Martin Lipset, (ed.), Politics and the Social Sciences (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), pp. 70-87.

political action.

Members of the Institute for American Democracy were found to be in agreement with their organization's view on these matters. IAD portrayed the American citizenry as competent and rational, capable of making reasonable decisions and, when given the "facts," opposed to extremists and their pleas.¹⁰ In brief, as already noted, there is very close agreement between IAD and its members on both ends and means in the effort to combat extremism and advance democratic practices.

IMPLICATIONS FOR INTEREST GROUP THEORY

The central conceptual scheme utilized in this research has been the group approach to political behavior. Two findings in this study have some significance for the development of this analytical model. As noted earlier, David Truman viewed the term "group" as referring, minimally, to any collection of persons who have some characteristic in common. Though he failed to acknowledge any role for ideology in American politics, a common belief system could constitute this characteristic, this adhesive force within the group, of which Truman wrote.

Future studies of interest groups should attempt to determine

¹⁰On the capabilities of Americans to participate in politics, as reflected by some political science studies, see Jack L. Walker, "A Critique of the Elitist Theory of Democracy," American Political Science Review, LX (June, 1966), 285-295; on the willingness of Americans to participate in politics see Robert J. Pranger, The Eclipse of Citizenship (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968). The views expressed in these studies are far more pessimistic than the IAD ideology.

whether or not an ideology functions within the organization in question, and to what extent it is dependent upon class or vocational interests as reflected by the members of that group. Hopefully, cases can be located where ideology functions as an independent variable and serves to bind the members together. From this situation a number of research possibilities emerge. What is the relationship between ideology and interest? To what extent does ideology affect the choice (or non-choice) of a policy arena, the policy position, and/or internal actions of the group?

Truman also indicated that some frequency of interaction among the individuals in a collective must occur before a group can be said to exist. As seen in the case of the Institute for American Democracy, this interaction need not be any type of person-to-person communication which implies personal identification and assumes perception and purposeful behavior and reciprocal action. Instead, as demonstrated in this study, interaction is characterized in both its subjective and objective dimensions so that it is minimally defined as an impersonal-organization-to-person-to-organization action/reaction set (or vice versa). The individual receives a printed appeal from a group, he reacts by forwarding funds because he identifies with the group. For this he receives a newsletter, reports, additional appeals, and similar ideological communiques. From time to time this individual responds with inquiries and suggestions for the group and reacts to its directives by taking some action which is suggested or is otherwise a consequence of the group's shared attitudes and beliefs.

Certain organizations, while they have many of the characteristics of traditional interest groups, do not, however, engage in direct political action. When examining the National Committee for an Effective Congress, Scoble noted that this body confined its activities to electoral politics, but did so in an indirect manner--soliciting funds and informing members about the backgrounds of candidates. Though he referred to NCEC as a "pseudo-party," Scoble contended that no precise label existed to describe it. Such a label is but momentarily suitable for what is actually being begged is a reformulation of the concept to which Scoble indicates NCEC has generic kinship. Thus, IAD might be termed a "pseudo-interest group" because, while it has a number of characteristics which are common among traditional interest groups, it does not, nevertheless, engage directly in politics. Such groups can recruit people into and inform them about the political world, but they urge these individuals to take action on behalf of the organization's cause but not in its name. The members know the responsibility for carrying forth the cause rests solely with them as the organization will not take any official action. In the case of IAD, its loss of tax exempt status might result in more direct political involvement for it as an organization and, in the event this loss occurs, any alteration of its official role or actual behavior will have to be assessed in terms of the impediment to direct involvement which this tax status imposed. For the moment, however, indirect political involvement makes the extent and impact of such an organization's activity neither easily recognized nor accurately

assessed. What is apparent, though, is a need to alter the current understanding of the concept of an interest group to accommodate the functioning of an entity like IAD.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DEMOCRACY

Every government, regardless of its principles or form, can be expected to engage in practices aimed at its own preservation. In a democracy, the task of ferreting out those seeking to destroy the political system has largely been left to the police. The individual citizen is only asked to cooperate with these officials and with the state in maintaining the governmental order. But there have been periods in American history when private citizens have been aroused by fears--nativism or xenophobia--and have engaged in large-scale efforts to purge the land of "un-Americans." In these dark episodes of jealousy, the very principles of freedom and democratic practice which were supposedly being defended became, in fact, lost when means antagonistic to democracy were utilized in their protection.¹¹

What emerges in the case of the non-partisan, non-sectarian, anti-extremist organization is a group of individuals who are not only aware of the presence and activities of extremists, but who are also

¹¹On forms of democracy limiting individual freedom see Giovanni Sartori, Democratic Theory (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965), Chapter 17; J. L. Talmon, The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1960).

sensitive to appropriate strategies and tactics for combatting those seeking to limit democratic practices. This is an organized effort by private citizens to defend democracy, regardless of sectarian or partisan considerations. These are "the people" of whom Jacques Maritain writes, "needed especially in the periods of crisis, birth, or basic renewal of a democratic society."¹² Certainly this is a unique role they play and perhaps the function they serve is possible only in a democratic system. They do not, as a group, seek to become an arm of the government for they recognize that the state, as well as any number of extremist organizations, may attempt to limit democracy. They stress participation and redress within the governmental system but champion the right of public protest as well. These are "realists" viewing the democratic prospect, regarding it, as E. E. Schattschneider notes, as "something for ordinary people, a political system designed to be sensitive to the needs of ordinary people regardless of whether or not the pedants approve of them."¹³ They have no power, no authority, no influence beyond their collective numbers, i. e. there is no agent working in their behalf within government; so that they must depend upon each member of the group generating an influence upon the machinery of the state. Such an organization constitutes a kind of "strategic elite" which is influential not

¹²See Jacques Maritain, Man And The State (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), pp. 139-146.

¹³E. E. Schattschneider, The Semi-Sovereign People (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1960), p. 135.

because of its specific activities but because of the scope of its activities, "that is, on how many members of society it directly impinges upon and in what respects."¹⁴ Their chief device for rallying support is the production of a reasoned argument supported by facts, a case which the rational and intelligent citizen outside of the organization, as well as within it, is expected to accept and support. The public is viewed as being neither a mystical nor a magically omnipotent power.¹⁵ The anti-extremists realize that not every citizen, regardless of his mental abilities, learns of their argument and, even if he does encounter and accept their view, his private agreement with it may not translate into public support for it.

Future research might explore the existence and nature of groups comparable to the Institute for American Democracy, as well as the types of issues emphasized by these organizations. Of paramount interest is the matter of strategy and tactics selected and the means by which such groups measure their own success. Subjects for this type of research might include Common Cause, the recently formed Committee for Public Justice, and the very new Council for Policy Evaluation. While these groups may not emulate the behavior of the Institute, they are, nevertheless, non-partisan and appear to be non-sectarian. They do represent

¹⁴On the concept and theory of strategic elites see Suzanne Keller, Beyond The Ruling Class (New York: Random House, 1963).

¹⁵Schattschneider, op. cit., p. 139.

entities similar to IAD in that they are organized citizen efforts designed to preserve democratic processes but do not do so by singling out specific enemies as extremists. Their behavior and influence are yet to be evaluated, however, for they are too new for meaningful research at present.

THE FUTURE OF THE ANTI-EXTREMIST ORGANIZATION

To use the currently popular terminology of the ecologists, is the non-partisan, non-sectarian, anti-extremist organization an "endangered species"; will it become extinct? During the brief period of the existence of the Institute for American Democracy, two other organizations of its type--the Freedom Institute at Iowa Wesleyan College and the Southern Committee on Political Ethics--ceased to operate. Their failure can be attributed largely to a lack of public interest and scarce financial resources. Neither group was launched with sufficient funds to advertise its existence and purpose. Also, they duplicated an effort already underway with IAD.

It becomes difficult, in view of the low visibility attached to these organizations, to evaluate their appeal. In 1968 and 1969 the public was willing to support three of these types of efforts. The elimination of George Wallace from the national scene apparently also reduced the perceived threat to democratic practices which he posed. Thus, interest in organizations dedicated to opposing extremists ceased to remain high simply because no dangers appeared on the immediate political horizon.

There is no indication that IAD recruited supporters from either

the Freedom Institute or SCOPE after these two groups ceased functioning. The Institute for American Democracy has, however, continued to attract members, indicating the existence of a core of citizens who are aware of the threats of extremists and wish to be part of some concerted effort to offset their advances. From this research it can be concluded that current IAD members are favorably disposed toward the Institute and are most interested in the cause it serves.

But, as was noted, numbers may not be sufficient to sustain the organization itself. Revenue from supporters is minimal because IAD supporters are drawn from a pool of individuals contributing to a variety of similar causes. If these persons are willing to provide only a minimum amount for the Institute's information now, will they remain with the organization if the minimum membership fee is raised? Certainly some would be lost but the question remains as to how many.

The Institute could attempt to attract new supporters from outside the current membership, but would these potential members contribute any more than those presently in IAD's ranks or would they be willing to join at a higher fee? Beyond these considerations, would new members from outside the "liberal pool" cause the program or activities of the Institute to be altered in some significant way?

Considered from the leadership side of the Institute, large amounts of revenue cannot be expected from past organizational supporters due to the generally depressed economy as well as to a variety of competing issues--the Middle East conflict, Vietnam protest efforts, national

strikes, and unsettled or shifting policy positions among organized religious groups and the AFL-CIO--which have drained funds. Inadequate financial resources means stagnation for IAD and continued low visibility.

It is quite evident that no proliferation of these particular type of organizations will soon occur. The Institute for American Democracy is currently in a precarious position but, if it can survive until the 1972 elections when interest in national politics may stimulate support for it, its future would seem somewhat more certain. Even now efforts are underway to attract new organizational supporters who will provide interim operating funds until 1972. Another plan calls for the creation of a holding company which can collect funds for several different non-partisan, non-sectarian, liberal causes. Such a company would then allocate money on a project basis to the different organizational members of the corporation. Utilizing a common staff, these groups would operate only when an issue relevant to their interest called for them to undertake a project in reaction to the issue in question.

If such alternatives fail and IAD falls in the next few years, some new entity of its type will probably succeed it. Such a development might take several years, however, if only because those involved in the creation and re-creation of such anti-extremist groups are, after thirty years of this process, becoming tired of having to re-establish such an organization periodically. While the public indicates sporadic interest in such a group--as when a sudden anti-democratic phenomenon occurs--those interested in a continuously operative anti-extremist organization,

regardless of the momentary need for same, may require some passage of time before their enthusiasm for such a venture will again build should IAD fail.

On the other hand, however, citizen organizations designed to preserve, protect, and advance democratic practice would seem to be a phenomenon of continued occurrence in the immediate future. As Schattschneider observes, popular causes such as civil rights and anti-war protests have drawn more and more people into political activity. For some it is a fashionable past-time, a sport, a status activity. Yet this tendency, combined with official state reaction on these issues, has resulted in a psychological transformation in the public mind regarding its role in politics. Moving beyond the House of Representatives as its traditional special agent and claiming control over the entire policy system, the people "believe that they have a general power over the government as a whole and not merely some power within the government."¹⁶ Such a sentiment will certainly motivate increased organized efforts in the name of democracy and its related ideals of freedom, liberty, equality, and popular participation in government. To the extent competing or limiting ideologies conflict with democratic practice, anti-extremists will be engaged in the task of exposing and combatting this enemy. As Schattschneider suggests: "If we want to understand what is happening

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 115-116.

to government we must look at what its rivals are doing, not merely at the formal institutions."¹⁷ The anti-extremists are such observers of these rivals.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 124.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Books

- Adorno, T. W., Else Frenkel-Brunswick, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Almond, Gabriel A., The Appeals of Communism. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954.
- Backstrom, Charles H., and Gerald D. Hursh, Survey Research. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1963.
- Beals, Carleton, Brass-Knuckle Crusade. New York: Hastings Co., 1960.
- Bell, Daniel, The End of Ideology. New York: Free Press, 1960.
- _____, (ed.), The Radical Right. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1963.
- Bentley, Arthur F., The Process of Government. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967; first published 1908.
- Billington, Ray Allen, The Protestant Crusade 1800-1860. New York: Rinehart, 1938.
- Bodo, John R., The Protestant Clergy and Public Issues 1812-1848. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954.
- Bramson, Leon, The Political Context of Sociology. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Breasted, Mary, Oh! Sex Education! New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1970.
- Brissenden, Paul F., The I. W. W. New York: Russell & Russell, 1957.
- Broyles, J. Allen, The John Birch Society: Anatomy of a Protest. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.
- Bryce, James, The American Commonwealth, Second Edition Revised. London: Macmillan Co., 1891.

- Carlson, John Roy (pseud.), The Plotters. New York: E. P. Dutton Co., 1946.
- _____, Under Cover. New York: E. P. Dutton Co., 1943.
- Chaplin, Ralph, Wobbly. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Cirino, Robert, Don't Blame The People. Los Angeles: Diversity Press, 1971.
- Cole, Wayne S., America First: The Battle Against Intervention 1940-1941. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1953.
- Connolly, William E., Political Science and Ideology. New York: Atherton Press, 1967.
- Coser, Lewis, The Functions of Social Conflict. New York: Free Press, 1956.
- Crick, Bernard, In Defense of Politics. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1964.
- Cummings, Homer, and Carl McFarland, Federal Justice. New York: Macmillan Co., 1937.
- Easton, David, The Political System. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953.
- Edelman, Murray, The Symbolic Uses of Politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967.
- Edwards, Allen L., Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.
- Ehrmann, Henry W., (ed.), Interest Groups on Four Continents. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1958.
- Finlay, David J., Ole R. Holsti, and Richard R. Fagen, Enemies in Politics. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1967.
- Free, Lloyd, and Hadley Cantril, The Political Beliefs of Americans. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968.
- Gordon, Milton M., Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Gurr, Ted Robert, Why Men Rebel. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

- Hamilton, Charles G., Lincoln and the Know Nothing Movement. Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1955.
- Havens, Murray Clark, The Challenges to Democracy. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965.
- Hofstadter, Richard, The Paranoid Style in American Politics. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.
- Hoke, Henry, Black Mail. New York: Reader's Book Service, 1944.
- _____, It's a Secret. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1946.
- Holsti, Ole R., Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Reading: Addison-Wesley Co., 1969.
- Johnson, Donald, The Challenge to American Freedoms. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1963.
- Jones, Maldwyn, American Immigration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Kinzer, Donald, An Episode in Anti-Catholicism. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964.
- Kirscht, John P., and Ronald C. Dillehay, Dimensions of Authoritarianism: A Review of Research and Theory. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967.
- Konwitz, Milton R., Civil Rights in Immigration. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1953.
- Lane, Robert E., Political Ideology. New York: Free Press, 1962.
- _____, Political Thinking and Consciousness. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1969.
- Lenski, Gerhard, The Religious Factor. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1961.
- Lindbergh, Charles A., The Wartime Journals of Charles A. Lindbergh. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Janovich, 1970.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, and Earl Raab, The Politics of Unreason. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

- Lippincott, Benjamin E., Democracy's Dilemma. New York: The Ronald Press, 1965.
- Lundberg, George, Foundations of Sociology. New York: Macmillan Co., 1939.
- MacIver, R. M., The Web of Government. New York: Macmillan Co., 1948.
- Mahoney, J. Daniel, Actions Speak Louder. New Rochelle: Arlington House, 1968.
- Markmann, Charles Lam, The Noblest Cry. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965.
- McEvoy, James, III, Radicals or Conservatives. Chicago: Rand McNally Co., 1971.
- Milbrath, Lester, Political Participation. Chicago: Rand McNally Co., 1965.
- Muller, Robert H., Theodore J. Spahn, and Janet M. Spahn, From Radical Left to Extreme Right. Ann Arbor: Campus Publishers, 1970.
- Murray, Robert K., Red Scare. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964.
- Myers, Gustavus, History of Bigotry in the United States. New York: Capricorn Books, 1960.
- Naess, Arne, Democracy, Ideology, and Objectivity. Oslo: Oslo University Press, 1956.
- Olson, Mancur, Jr., The Logic of Collective Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Oppenheim, A. N., Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, 1966.
- Piller, E. A., Time Bomb. New York: Arco Publishing Co., 1945.
- Post, Louis F., The Deportation Delirium of Nineteen-Twenty. Chicago: H. Kerr, 1923.
- Preston, William, Jr., Aliens and Dissenters. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

- Robinson, John P., Jerrold G. Rusk, and Kendra B. Head, (eds.), Measures of Political Attitudes. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1968.
- _____, and Phillip R. Shaver, (eds.), Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969.
- Roche, John P., The Quest for the Dream. New York: Macmillan Co., 1963.
- Rokeach, Milton, The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Rosenberg, Morris, The Logic of Survey Analysis. New York: Basic Books, 1968.
- Roy, Ralph Lord, Apostles of Discord. Boston: Beacon Press, 1953.
- Rudin, Josef, Fanaticism. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
- Schattschneider, E. E., The Semi-Sovereign People. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1960.
- Schoenberger, Robert A., (ed.), The American Right Wing. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.
- Scoble, Harry, Ideology and Electoral Action. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1967.
- Simmel, Georg, Conflict & The Web of Group-Affiliations. New York: Free Press, 1955; portions first published in America 1904.
- Smelser, Neil J., Theory of Collective Behavior. New York: Free Press, 1962.
- Stouffer, Samuel A., Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966; first published 1955.
- Survey Research Center, Manual for Coders. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1961.
- Toch, Hans, The Social Psychology of Social Movements. New York and Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1965.

- de Tocqueville, Alexis, Democracy In America. New York: Vintage Books, 1945; first published 1862.
- Truman, David B., The Governmental Process. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951.
- Waxman, Chaim I., (ed.), The End of Ideology Debate. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968.
- Williams, Michael, The Shadow of the Pope. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1932.
- Wittke, Carl, We Who Built America. Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University Press, 1970.
- Zeigler, Harmon, Interest Groups In American Society. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Co., 1964.

II. Periodicals

- Andreason, Alan R., "Personalizing Mail Questionnaire Correspondence," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIV (Summer, 1970), 273-277.
- Congressional Record, CXI (October 22, 1965), 28303-28306.
- _____, CXIV (October 15, 1968), E9204-E9210.
- _____, CXV (June 24, 1969), S6998-S7037.
- Crotty, William, "The Utilization of Mailed Questionnaires," Western Political Quarterly, XIX (March, 1966), 44-54.
- Dowling, R. E., "Pressure Group Theory: Its Methodological Range," American Political Science Review, LIV (December, 1960), 944-954.
- Gayer, Dixon, "Extremism: The Indefinable Nothing," The Dixon Line, V (July-August, 1968), 1, 4-6, 16.
- Golembiewski, Robert T., "The Group Basis of Politics: Notes on Analysis and Development," American Political Science Review, LI V (December, 1960), 38-51.
- Gurr, Ted, "Psychological Factors in Civil Violence," World Politics XX (January, 1969), 245-278.

- Harned, Louise, "Authoritarian Attitudes and Party Activity," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXV (Fall, 1961), 393-399.
- Kahn, E. J., Jr., "Profiles: Democracy's Friend," The New Yorker, XXIII (July 26, 1947), 28-35; (August 2, 1947), 28-38; (August 9, 1947), 27-38.
- Latham, Earl, "The Group Basis of Politics: Notes for a Theory," American Political Science Review, XLVI (June, 1952), 376-397.
- Litt, Edgar, "Civic Education, Community Norms, and Political Indoc-trination," American Sociological Review, XXVIII (February, 1963), 69-75.
- McClosky, Herbert, "Consensus and Ideology in American Politics," American Political Science Review, LVIII (June, 1964), 361-382.
- _____, Paul J. Hoffmann, and Rosemary O'Hare, "Issue Conflict and Consensus among Party Leaders and Followers," American Political Science Review, LIV (June, 1960), 406-427.
- Minar, David W., "Ideology and Political Behavior," Midwest Journal of Political Science, V (November, 1964), 317-331.
- Mullally, Donald P., "The Fairness Doctrine: Benefits and Costs," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXIII (Winter, 1969-1970), 577-583.
- Odegard, Peter H., "A Group Basis of Politics: A New Name for an Ancient Myth," Western Political Quarterly, XI (September, 1958), 689-702.
- Proshansky, Harold M., and Richard I. Evans, "The 'Radical Right' A Threat to the Behavioral Sciences," Journal of Social Issues, XIX (April, 1963), 86-106.
- Robinson, John P., "Public Reaction to Political Protest: Chicago 1968," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXIV (Spring, 1970), 1-9.
- Rokeach, Milton, "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism," Psychological Review, LXI (May, 1954), 194-204.
- Rosenberg, Morris, "Misanthropy and Political Ideology," American Sociological Review, XXI (December, 1956), 690-695.
- Rush, G. B., "Toward A Definition of the Extreme Right," Pacific Sociological Review, VI (Fall, 1963), 64-73.

Salisbury, Robert H., "An Exchange Theory of Interest Groups," Midwest Journal of Political Science, XIII (February, 1969), 1-32.

Scoble, Harry, and Stanley Bachrach, "Mail Questionnaire Efficiency: Controlled Reduction of Non-Response," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXI (Summer, 1967), 265-277.

III. Special Documents and Publications

Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, National Education Association, Suggestions for Defense Against Extremist Attack: Sex Education in the Public Schools, National Education Association, Washington, D. C. (1970).

Institute for American Democracy, Committee Handbook, Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (first edition, n. d.; revised 1969).

_____, How To Combat Air Pollution, Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (n. d.).

_____, "Who's Behind George?", Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (n. d.).

National Council for Civic Responsibility, "Facing Extremism," Public Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C. (1965).

Research Division, Republican National Committee, The 1968 Elections, Republican National Committee, Washington, D. C. (1969).

SCOPE, "George C. Wallace, The Man and The Men Around Him," Southern Committee on Political Ethics, Washington, D. C. (1968).

_____, "The Wallace Labor Record," Southern Committee on Political Ethics, Washington, D. C. (1968).

Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, House of Representatives, Lobbying Direct and Indirect: Part 7, Public Affairs Institute, 81st Congress, Second Session (1950).

Subcommittee on Communications, Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, Anonymous Use of Automatic Telephone Devices, 89th Congress, Second Session (1965).

IV. Newspapers

Los Angeles Times, September 17, 1968.

_____, October 31, 1965.

New York Herald-Tribune, October 3, 1965.

New York Post, March 3, 1965.

New York Times, September 20, 1964.

_____, September 21, 1964.

_____, September 23, 1964.

_____, October 8, 1964.

_____, October 18, 1964.

_____, February 18, 1965.

_____, October 15, 1965.

_____, October 22, 1965.

_____, April 20, 1966.

_____, November 19, 1966.

_____, September 13, 1968.

_____, March 20, 1969.

_____, June 10, 1969.

_____, August 11, 1969.

_____, September 27, 1970.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 29, 1965.

Washington Evening Star, October 22, 1964.

_____, November 28, 1967.

_____, October 18, 1970.

_____, February 15, 1971.

Washington Post, October 8, 1964.

_____, November 23, 1964.

_____, February 17, 1965.

_____, March 3, 1965.

_____, August 25, 1968.

_____, January 11, 1970.

_____, September 12, 1970.

_____, October 28, 1970.

_____, February 16, 1971.

_____, March 11, 1971.

V. Newsletters

Freedom Institute Newsletter, 1968-1969.

Friends of Democracy's Battle, 1946-1949.

Homefront, 1967-1971.

The City Reporter, 1941-1942.

The Propaganda Battlefront, 1937-1946.

VI. Public Memorandums and Fund Appeal Letters

Allen, Steve, letter of February 14, 1968, Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C.

Baker, Charles R., letter of June 22, 1970, Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C.

Institute for American Democracy, "Memo to Citizens Inquiring about Some Specific IAD Policies," Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (April 14, 1967).

_____, Memo to Sponsoring Committee, Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (February 10, 1967).

Littell, Franklin H., letter of October 3, 1968, Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa.

VII. Unpublished Documents

Baker, Charles R., "Annual Report for May 13th Meeting, 1968," Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (1968).

_____, "Annual Report for May 23rd Meeting, 1967," Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (1967).

_____, Memo to IAD Board of Sponsors [Confidential], Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (January 13, 1970).

Broyles, John A., "The John Birch Society as a Movement of Social Protest of the Radical Right," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, Boston, 1963.

Institute for American Democracy, board meeting minutes, New York, New York (November 20, 1968).

_____, "Projected Plan of Action-Draft," Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (August 25, 1966).

Rohrer, Ira, "Radical Rightists: An Empirical Study," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1967.

Ruder & Finn, Inc., "Program: Speaking Up For Democracy," Ruder & Finn, Inc., New York, New York (March 30, 1964).

Schoenberger, Robert A., "Conservatives and Conservatism: A Study of the Attitudes and Characteristics of Conservative and Republican Party Members." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Rochester, Rochester, 1967.

Wolfinger, Raymond E., Barbara K. Wolfinger, Kenneth Prewitt, and Shelia Rosenhack, "The Clientele of the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade." A paper read at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Commodore Hotel, New York, New York (September 4-7, 1963).

APPENDIX I.

THE GROWTH OF ANTI-EXTREMIST ORGANIZATIONS

Because the non-partisan, non-sectarian anti-extremist organization is a phenomenon of the last four decades, no history of this type of group has yet been compiled. Indeed, source materials are extremely fugitive and many of the personalities involved either are no longer living or now hold positions out of the public eye. War time paper shortages and popular emotions at the time have made collections of both extremist and anti-extremist literature practically non-existent. Individuals who participated in the cause of opposing the ideological fringes during World War II and the years on through the McCarthy era often became repelled by such "visceral politics" and many experienced personal unpleasanties which resulted in their changing vocations and seeking the less visible levels of political activity.

In the course of conversation, however, most of those who have been part of the anti-extremist movement will confess an abiding interest in extremist activity, a fascination which, for some, is comparable to the proverbial moth and candle. Their activism spent, they wish to remain informed. And it may be this impetus, this desire to know and to let others know what the ultras are doing, that has propagated a continuing species of anti-extremist organizations. And, as one expert on extremism has commented, "all you have to do is lift their rock and watch them run." Perhaps sophisticated America, with its "civic

culture, " recognizes extremists once they are exposed, and discounts them. Or, on the other hand, it may be that the extremists, once forced into the light, think they are undone. Whatever the case, the net effect remains the same.

The Friends Of Democracy

Returning from a vacation trip to Germany in the summer of 1935, Rev. Leon M. Birkhead was highly aware of the growing threat of Nazism and the inroads of the National Socialists in America. Four years earlier he had heard his German friends discount Hitler as a "transitory pest. " When he returned to Europe he not only found a different attitude but also discovered that a number of those who had discounted the Nazis earlier were no longer known to exist. They had disappeared! But a more alarming revelation occurred when Birkhead chanced to visit one Paul Wurm, a Nazi functionary and an associate of Julius Streicher. The exact nature of the visit is unknown today but in the course of conversation the braggardly Wurm told the aging, paunchy and otherwise disarming preacher about Americans who were favorable to the German Reich and serving its cause. Attempting to convert Birkhead, Wurm brandished a sheaf of letters from those Americans sympathizers. Regarding Birkhead as a bumbling tourist, Wurm turned his back long enough for his attentive guest to note several of the names in the correspondence. A few days later these names appeared in American papers, courtesy of the Associated Press. The issuing office was Berlin.

Birkhead also visited Russia during his 1935 vacation but found the suspicious Communists much less boastful and guarded in commenting upon their "friends" in America. Nevertheless, Birkhead got a first hand look at the Marxist dream state and some impressions about Soviet concerns for depressed America.

Upon returning home, however, he discovered his dispatch from Germany had created little excitement. While he did not trust the Communists himself, the government's official policy of toleration seemed to be well balanced with continuous surveillance practices. Indeed, Congress, police officials at various levels of government, and a variety of state agencies had kept the Bolsheviks under close scrutiny since the "Red Scare" at the close of the Great War. But, wondered Birkhead, who was watching the American Right-Wingers?¹ Others that same year would ask the same question, but would supplement it with their own findings. These commentators included the respected radio reporter Raymond Gram Swing,² leftist correspondent John L. Spivak who frequently wrote for the suspect New Masses,³ and John Franklin Carter, a New Deal expert on the political fringe movements who wrote published commentary

¹See E. J. Kahn, "Profiles: Democracy's Friend, " The New Yorker, XXIII (July 26, 1947), 33.

²Raymond Gram Swing, Forerunners of American Fascism (New York: Julian Messner, Inc., 1935).

³John L. Spivak, America Faces The Barricades (New York: Covici, Friede Publishers, 1935); portions of this book appeared in New Masses.

under the name Jay Franklin and "The Unofficial Observer."⁴ Inspired by these analyses and his own personal experiences, Birkhead began his own program of investigating rightist causes.

If Leon Birkhead impressed politicians like Nazi Paul Wurm as harmless and commonplace, the image was only one of physical appearance. Out in his native Kansas, L. M. Birkhead was never regarded as commonplace, at least not for long, and more than a few of his fellow clerics and local parishoners soon came to revise their estimates of him as "harmless". He was born in 1885 on a farm a little way from Winfield, Missouri, just northwest of St. Louis. His parents, English in origin, were belligerently pro-democracy and his Methodist grandparents had frequently skirmished with the forces of slavery both before and during the War Between the States. The oldest of seven children, L. M., as he came to be known, was urged to become a professional man. He chose the ministry. In 1904 he entered McKendree College, a small Methodist school in Lebanon, Illinois, and six years later earned his A.B. This was followed with graduate work at Drew Theological Seminary in New Jersey and Union Theological Seminary in New York. He

⁴"The Unofficial Observer," American Messiahs (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1935); in reference to Carter's New Deal role see Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Politics of Upheaval (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1960), pp. 141-42; Carter became an intelligence chief at the White House during World War II and was a Truman speechwriter in 1948 but shortly thereafter became an ardent anti-Communist and of some right-wing causes; see obituary notice, Washington Evening Star, November 28, 1967.

even had a brief philosophy course or two at Columbia University but never earned additional degrees.

Ordained a Methodist preacher in 1911, he took a pastorate in St. Louis where he soon became known for his unorthodox preaching and social gospel approach to the Scriptures. In addition to his pulpit "antics," he created a debating society called the Open Forum where a variety of unchurchly topics greeted the ears of the curious faithful. Through this vehicle he met Roger Baldwin who was organizing the American Civil Liberties Union of which Birkhead became an active member. Theological doubts about the interpretation of the Bible caused L. M. to leave the Methodists in late 1914 but he promptly found a more comfortable pulpit with the Unitarians. He spent two years in Wichita, building his congregation through newspaper appeals to attend services, before becoming pastor of All Souls in Kansas City in 1917. His un-orthodoxy prevailed, however, and the church soon came to be formally known as the Liberal Center to which "All Souls Unitarian Church" was occasionally appended. His worldly ways and firm but unusual theological beliefs caused some to question whether he even believed in God. At one point in his preaching career he had said: "I believe in the religion of humanity, and that true religion is found in intelligent devotion to human welfare and such significant human values as truth, freedom, justice, goodness, and beauty."⁵ He denied he was an atheist but declined to rigidly espouse

⁵Kahn, op. cit., (August 9, 1947), 32.

theological values. His religious commitment to these social and political values did not, however, prevent his keeping an open mind on public issues or cause him to remain detached from religious controversy.

Sharply contrasting with the majority of his Midwest clerics, he drove to Dayton, Tennessee, in the summer of 1925 to be on hand for the Scopes trial. Here he pitched a tent on the lawn outside the house his friend Clarence Darrow was occupying. Birkhead and his family stayed in the tent while observing the spectacle of William Jennings Bryan defending Christendom. During the trial Birkhead met H. L. Mencken, a man well known for his views on religion, the church, and its servants. The encounter with the Baltimore Sage led to a lasting friendship between the two men.

Early in 1926, perhaps on Mencken's advice, Sinclair Lewis came to Kansas City in search of Birkhead whom he wanted to assist him in a technical capacity for a novel about preachers. In addition to exposing Lewis to a variety of Eastern theologies, Birkhead escorted his guest on a tour of local churches of varying denominations and recruited an interdenominational panel of clergymen to meet weekly with Lewis to discuss their profession. When the novelist ultimately sought a secluded spot to prepare his text, he invited the Birkhead family to join him so his technical adviser would be close at hand. It was L. M. who chose the name for the principle character and title of the book--Elmer Gantry. A decade later the novelist reciprocated his friend's favor and chose

the name of the new anti-extremist group Birkhead had created--Friends of Democracy.⁶

When he returned from Europe in 1935, Birkhead had decided some action had to be taken against the growing threat posed by American rightists. The following year he made a number of public speeches warning of the extremist threat and found a highly visible target in fundamentalist preacher Gerald B. Winrod, a man with whom he had clashed in the 1920's over the evolution question. Having quietly founded the Friends in 1937, Birkhead attacked Winrod the following year when the rightist minister declared he would be a candidate in the Kansas Republican primary for the nomination for United States Senator. Birkhead went to work with a two-pronged attack which he would repeat over and over for the next twenty-three years. The Kansas Friends of Democracy issued a pamphlet entitled "What's Wrong With Winrod?" which outlined his activities and drew statements from his Defender publication which portrayed his anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic beliefs. On a second front, Birkhead took his information to Alf M. Landon who encouraged John D. M. Hamilton, then chairman of the Republican National Committee, to denounce Winrod a few weeks before the primary. Winrod came in third but continued to remain high on Birkhead's list of anti-democrats.⁷

The Friends' effort against Winrod brought them to national

⁶Ibid., 33-35.

⁷Kahn, op. cit., (July 26, 1947), 34.

attention and established their method of combatting extremists, a tactic which Birkhead called "pitiless publicity". The Friends launched a newsletter at their founding which, until 1946, was called The Propaganda Battlefront. On November 30, 1946, the name was changed to Friends of Democracy's Battle and it ran until 1950. Kenneth Birkhead, Leon's son and the executive director of the Friends, estimates the circulation of the newsletter to have been between 10,000 and 18,000 copies per issue during FOD's operation.⁸

In addition to the newsletter, the Friends printed and distributed an estimated forty million pieces of expository literature during its first ten years of existence.⁹ The bulk of this consisted of seven elaborate brochures which dealt with persons or organizations which Birkhead felt endangered democracy. The subjects of these studies included Father Charles Coughlin, Gerald L. K. Smith, Henry Ford, Charles A. Lindbergh, the America First Committee, Joseph P. Kamp, and Joseph E. McWilliams.¹⁰ Coughlin's activities are fairly well known today and recently, after a long period of silence, he has indicated a renewed interest in contemporary political issues.¹¹ Smith continues to propagand-

⁸Interview with Kenneth Birkhead, Washington, D. C., February 3, 1971.

⁹Kahn, op. cit., (July 26, 1947), 29.

¹⁰Ibid., (August 2, 1947), 30.

¹¹Father Charles E. Coughlin, Helmet and Sword (Bloomfield Hills, Michigan: Helmet and Sword, a Non-Profit Corporation, 1968).

ize and remain active in ultra-right circles, his anti-Semitic rantings leaping out of his Cross and Flag magazine like a resurrected dodo. He is now the chief circulator of Henry Ford's International Jew.¹² Joseph Kamp remains active; he worked with the House Committee on Un-American Activities and defending Senator Joseph McCarthy during the 1950's, appeared on the Board of Policy of Liberty Lobby and did extensive pamphleteering for his own Headlines operation and for other rightist groups during the 1960's, and currently appears on the Board of Editors of the Lobby's esoteric relative, American Mercury, which has been a right-wing captive for a number of years. Even McWilliams, long in retirement, supposedly indicated an interest in Chicago politics a few years ago.¹³

While the Friends of Democracy apparently found genuine extremists in these targets, two of their quarry have been given some defense since that time. Writing what was described as a "well-balanced history" of the America First Committee, Wayne S. Cole has charged the Friends with being biased toward the cause of England and the French. Indeed, interlocking supporters did exist between the Friends and the Fight for Freedom Committee, the leading pro-war, internationalist

¹²Henry Ford, Sr., The International Jew (Los Angeles: Christian Nationalist Crusade, n. d.).

¹³Private communication to the author, Chicago Committee for Advancing the Democratic Process, Chicago, Illinois, 1967.

organization of the day which was urging American involvement in the European conflict. Birkhead had English ancestry and was known to hold an internationalist position on Continental hostilities. Specifically, however, the Friends had charged:

The America First Committee . . . is a Nazi front! It is a transmission belt by means of which the apostles of Nazism are spreading their antidemocratic ideas into millions of American homes!

This is not to say that the America First Committee is a Nazi organization. On the contrary, the great majority of its officers and members are patriotic Americans who sincerely believe that this nation should pursue a policy of isolationism and appeasement.

But that is exactly what Adolf Hitler and his disciples in the United States believe, and they are using--or misusing--the America First Committee to spread these ideas.

We do not question the integrity of the leadership and membership of the America First Committee nor the sincerity of its program. But we do seriously question the wisdom of the policymakers and the soundness of a policy which has the unqualified approval of Adolf Hitler, Benito Mussolini and their agents in the United States.¹⁴

The pamphlet also included statements by America First spokesmen which closely paralleled those of Hitler. Certain individuals attending an America First rally in New York were singled out and their affiliations with right-wing extremist organizations were cited. Even a Berlin broadcast which favorably cited the Committee received mention. But in addition to these bits of evidence, Cole's own account cites a number of rightist functionaries who, at the time, were echoing the Nazi line, and this was the substance of the Friends' charge.¹⁵

¹⁴Friends of Democracy, "The America First Committee--The Nazi Transmission Belt," Friends of Democracy, New York, New York, n. d. (circa 1940).

¹⁵Wayne S. Cole, America First: The Battle Against Intervention, 1940-1941 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1953), see pp. 109-30.

Charles Lindbergh, an America First hero who made a number of controversial statements about American foreign policy during the pre-war period (he was also an honored guest of the Nazis in 1936 and 1938, receiving a decoration on the latter occasion), also came in for criticism from the Friends. Their argument was similar to that leveled against America Firsters, that Lindbergh was blind to the fact that the Nazis were using him. In his recently released journals of this period, Lindbergh offers the defense that his actions, at the time, were correct, regardless of their close similarity to German designs, and that history has, in some way, proven his position to be the right one.¹⁶ Reflecting on this attack on Lindbergh, Kenneth Birkhead, the son of Leon Birkhead and former executive director of the Friends, in a recent interview commented that he still believed Lindbergh was an unwitting victim of the ultra right, used to publicize extreme views and to rally supporters. Noting Lindbergh's position as stated in his journals, Birkhead conceded the Friends may have been a bit over zealous in their assault upon him. He recalled the picture on the cover of the Lindbergh expose portrayed the Lone Eagle in what appeared to be a Nazi style salute. The pamphlet did not say such was the case, but it did not dispel the illusion that Lindbergh had gone over to the Germans. He stressed that his father felt it was imperative to expose Lindbergh at the time, primarily because of

¹⁶Charles A. Lindbergh, The Wartime Journals of Charles A. Lindbergh (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Janovich, 1970).

the following he was building rather than of any personal viewpoint he held, but probably would be among the first to forgive Lindbergh for his actions now.¹⁷

It was once estimated that ninety-eight percent of the Friends' efforts were devoted to exposing extreme Rightists with emphasis being upon the anti-Semitic elements within that ideological wing.¹⁸ Communists came in for their share of "pitiless publicity" too. When Birkhead found some group to which he had lent his support had become the captive of Communists, he would try to wrest control from the extremists, or, failing that, would resign. Toward the end of the war the Friends sponsored a series of books on various extremists. At the time of the San Francisco Conference they furnished, at the request of the State Department, background information on extremist elements which sought to undermine the United Nations.¹⁹ In the Cold War period denominations of the Protestant Church were assisted in rooting out Communists and their sympathizers.²⁰ Ironically, on the eve of McCarthyism, the Friends economically collapsed and in 1955 L. M. Birkhead, their driving force, died of a heart attack.

¹⁷Interview with Kenneth Birkhead, Washington, D. C., February 3, 1971.

¹⁸Kahn, op. cit., (August 9, 1947), 27.

¹⁹Ibid., (July 26, 1947), 30.

²⁰See Ralph Lord Roy, Apostles of Discord (Boston: Beacon Press, 1953), pp. 274-75.

One authority on the Friends estimated its supporting membership to be somewhere around 11,000 people.²¹ Kenneth Birkhead, who was executive director of the group, placed the regular contributorship more conservatively in the range of 3,000-4,000 but added that the organization's newsletter went to anywhere between 10,000 to 18,000 subscribers. Membership in the Friends was never formally established. Local chapters of FOD were not encouraged though local sponsors did create their own discussion groups and affiliated, as a group, with FOD nationally. The central office, for most of the years the Friends existed, was in New York City where a staff of twenty to thirty people worked. Kenneth Birkhead recalls that the majority of these "employees" were, however, volunteers. An office was maintained in Kansas City, where the group was incorporated, with a staff of two. An office was maintained in Boston with a staff of three and one in Chicago with a staff of two.²² Lending the prestige of their names to the group were such notables as Rex Stout, who was national chairman, Louis Bromfield, Van Wyck Brooks, John Dewey, Will Durant, Thomas Mann, and Westbrook Pegler, all national committee members.²³ Pegler, who subsequently resigned shortly after joining the group because he did not want to sponsor "activity which might ensue after a few men had acquired the power that would be theirs with so much money at their command," later became an ardent spokes-

²¹Kahn, op. cit., (August 2, 1947), 34.

²²Ibid., 32.

²³Ibid., (July 26, 1947), 36.

man for a number of ultra-right causes.²⁴

Pegler's fears never had any real basis. The Friends never had an operating budget which exceeded \$150,000 for any one year and frequently operated on much less. Half their funds were collected through annual banquets and Birkhead's salary as National Director remained at \$10,000 a year.²⁵

FOD's files, consulted by Army and Navy intelligence, the Civil Service Commission, and used by the Justice Department in its war time sedition cases, were fed by daily press accounts. The organization enjoyed a close working relationship with the major newspapers and, of course, with other groups also pledged to combatting racism and extremism. Volunteers would send reports to FOD headquarters but the Friends did not encourage spying and relied on public information sources for the substantiation of their charges of anti-democratic activities. The notable exception to this working rule, however, was the dramatic John Roy Carlson who produced two controversial books on his underground spying among extremists.²⁶ Carlson was his pen name. His real name was Avedis Derounian and he was born in Greece of Armenian parents in

²⁴See Oliver Pilot, Pegler: Angry Man of the Press (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963).

²⁵Kahn, op. cit., (August 2, 1947), 34.

²⁶John Roy Carlson, Under Cover (New York: E. P. Dutton Co., 1943); John Roy Carlson, The Plotters (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1946).

1909, became a naturalized U. S. citizen in 1926, and joined Birkhead's staff in 1940 at \$50 a week. The idea of secret spying was, however, Carlson's and there is no indication that the information he gathered was ever directly used by FOD in its own exposure efforts. Instead, Carlson produced two books, the first selling 700,000 copies and the second 60,000, which discuss his activities and findings. His volumes were acclaimed and recommended by Walter Winchell but he was also sued for libel, two decisions going against him.²⁷ Yet his books came as bombshells, exploding on an American public which was sensitive to the possibility of a Nazi underground but which was astonished at its extent and breadth of operation.

FOD also took direct credit for producing some other volumes on extremists activity. Friends newsletter editor Henry Hoke authored two such volumes.²⁸ E. A. Piller produced a short book²⁹ as did FOD staff member Ralph Lord Roy.³⁰ Undoubtedly much of the material for Gordon Hall's study of the anti-U. N. campaign came from FOD sources, for Hall was once a Friends staff member who has gone on to become

²⁷Kahn, op. cit., (August 2, 1947), 35-36.

²⁸Henry Hoke, Black Mail (New York: Reader's Book Service, Inc., 1944); Henry Hoke, It's a Secret (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1946).

²⁹E. A. Piller, Time Bomb (New York: Arco Publishing Co., 1945).

³⁰Ralph Lord Roy, Apostles of Discord (Boston: Beacon Press, 1953).

one of the most authoritative lecturers on the topic of extremism.³¹ In addition to these, numerous journalists, free-lancers, authors, and writers of all types profited by access to FOD files and expertise. It is another irony of the Friends' demise that, when the organization collapsed, only a small portion of the research material was transferred to allied groups. The bulk of the data was scattered, lost, and destroyed. Of those connected with the group, only Gordon Hall remains active in the field of scrutinizing extremists.

Friends of Democracy described itself as:

a non-profit, non-partisan, non-sectarian organization supported wholly by voluntary contributions, . . . the nation's clearing house for information on subversive, totalitarian, and all other organized anti-democratic movements of whatever brand and from whatever source.³²

Birkhead once described "subversives" as:

those persons (or doctrines) seeking to overthrow or destroy existing institutions. In a democratic country advocates of both Communism and Fascism are subversive, for they would overthrow and destroy democratic government.³³

Simultaneously, he described democracy as:

³¹Gordon Hall, The Hate Campaign Against the U. N. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1952); for a discussion of Hall's activities see Roul Tunley, "Battler Against Bigotry," The Saturday Evening Post, CCXXXV (December 8, 1962), 28ff; and for an indication of Hall's current views see: Gordon Hall, "Extremism: Sickness of the Sixties," Boston Magazine (October, 1964), 1-8; Gordon Hall, "The Diminishing Thunder on the Radical Right," Washington Post, August 1, 1970.

³²This phrase appeared on a number of FOD publications and on almost every newsletter.

³³Friends of Democracy's Battle, VII (October 1, 1949), 4.

The theory and practice of government by the people; democracy combines (1) periodic election of government officials by the great body of adult inhabitants, (2) freedom for political parties of all kinds to seek the support of the voters, (3) freedom of speech, press, religion, and assembly, (4) any economic system which the voters through their elected representatives may choose; usually this system is capitalism modified to a greater or lesser degree--greater in Great Britain, lesser in the United States, and to a large extent in the Scandanavian democracies where capitalism, government ownership, and cooperatives blend in making up the economic system, (5) an increasing tendency toward an internationalism which calls upon the free people of the world to band together to preserve the peace. The class structure in a democratic country is based upon achievement, educational standards, family background, and wealth. Democracy customarily is referred to as a middle-of-the-road ideology.³⁴

The disclaimer of a sectarian bias, commitment to open communication and participation, tolerance of differing points of view, and support for the so-called Bill of Rights "freedom" were the principles not only of the Friends but of succeeding non-partisan, non-sectarian anti-extremist groups which sought to defend democracy. But Birkhead was no apologist for the status quo. He described a "friend of democracy" as:

one who is genuinely devoted to the principles of the Bill of Rights. People who hate Catholics or Jews are violating those principles and are not friends of democracy. Anyone who attacks minorities or wants to discriminate against them in any way is not a friend of democracy. Democracy, as I conceive it, is the middle-of-the-road procedure and not any extreme, fanatical idea. We live in a very complex world. No one has all the answers. As it says in our bulletin, friends of democracy must have faith in the infinite improvability of mankind. We have to keep the door to change open, and not let the extreme Right or the extreme Left slam it shut. To me, democracy means the open door. When I attempt to judge the enemies of democracy, I try to find out their attitude toward closing that door.³⁵

³⁴Ibid., 2.

³⁵Kahn, op. cit., (July 26, 1947), 31.

In the end, it is the potential for social change which was defended and that defense required an assessment of both action and thought. The weapon was information--"pitiless publicity"--gathered, analyzed, and disseminated in that very atmosphere Friends of Democracy sought to maintain and preserve, the open society. Such philosophical or theoretical ideals as those articulated here contributed to this ideology of exposing the despoilers of democracy who would substitute some other model and theory of government which precluded change.

Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League

Another organization of related interest is the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, founded in 1933 by Samuel Untermyer. This group initially concerned itself with a boycott of German goods sold in America during the 1930's. During the war years it duplicated the information activities of the Friends of Democracy but, instead of focusing upon the extremists of both the left and the right, the League gathered data chiefly on racists and the fanatics of the American right who were allied with Axis agents. At the end of the war the organization turned its attention to neo-Nazi and paramilitary groups operating in the United States. These included such obvious racists and identifiable bully-boys as the Columbians in Georgia and elements of the Ku Klux Klan.³⁶ Unwilling to take a more aggressive role in combatting some of the subtler ultra

³⁶Ibid., 29.

rightists, the League went into rapid decline during the last years of the 1940's. It never cultivated a membership or following, as did the Friends, though it certainly had a constituency. While an attempt has been made to keep files up-to-date, the League's holdings derive mainly from rightist activities of the 1930's and 1940's. As indicated, their material on the post-war period concerns the more muscular groups which both private anti-extremist organizations and public agencies have also scrutinized. It is an operative but quite inactive organization today.

While the League has lingered on as something of a relic from the Nazi experience, a multiplicity of anti-extremist groups burst upon the scene when war broke out in Europe in 1939. With the conclusion of hostilities, most faded away while the others abandoned the extremism issue for economic and political matters of special interest to an America tired of world war and unaware of the impending Cold War. One study produced during this twilight period counted eleven national organizations, two regional groups, fifteen state bodies, and 134 local units committed to anti-extremism. Undoubtedly, few of these could be called non-partisan and/or non-sectarian. Indeed, as their names readily indicate in some instances, they were church or union related and frequently had racism as their central concern.³⁷ Nevertheless, the proliferation of these groups demonstrates popular concern with extremism and the degree of political organization which can occur on this issue.

³⁷Piller, op. cit., pp. 184-94.

Typical of the local committees was the New York City Co-ordinating Committee for Democratic Action, organized in 1940 and discontinued sometime in 1945. Its stated purpose was

to promote democracy, democratic institutions, civil liberties, racial and religious goodwill and cooperation. We will oppose all anti-democratic tendencies, movements and organizations, and all forms of totalitarian dictatorship--Nazi, Communist, Fascist, or any other movement that may arise in the future, and their advocates and apologists in this country. We will use all means and methods at our disposal, consistent with democratic procedure, to combat these un-American ideas and movements.

We will develop a program of public education for democracy, and also organizational channels through which our citizenry can make articulate their support of democracy and their continuous opposition to anti-democratic ideas, measures, organizations and movements. The Committee shall seek coordination of information and activity among the various bodies concerned in actively preserving democracy in New York City.

It shall also strive to form new bodies to pursue its cause. We will lend active aid to all those groups and organizations in our community that are genuinely concerned with the retention and advancement of democracy and democratic institutions, not as a matter of mere temporary and expedient policy to conceal anti-democratic objectives, but as a matter of permanent principle and profound conviction that no more effective political structure for human welfare has yet been developed anywhere.³⁸

These ambitious plans and high ideals actually were reduced to eight practical functions once America entered the war. Non-partisan, non-sectarian, and opposed to extremes of the left and right, the Committee attempted:

1. organizing local neighborhood groups
2. gathering information and spreading it via "The City Reporter"
3. leadership training
4. consultation service, research projects

³⁸The City Reporter, III (March 25, 1941), 5.

5. speakers bureau
6. preparation and distribution of simple democratic literature
7. maintaining a working library
8. reporting enemy activity to the authorities.³⁹

In fact, the Committee relied heavily upon the Friends of Democracy for research support and library materials. Its chief projects were the creation of local discussion groups on the neighborhood level which served to keep the Committee informed of extremist activity in their area and, secondly, to produce and distribute a mimeographed newsletter which reported on current extremist developments. While the circulation of The City Reporter was never really determined, it had a wide readership due to its street sale and occasional free distribution. In brief, its contents were nothing more than a collection of recent events reported in the city newspapers or first-hand accounts by local discussion group representatives. It appeared to be quite factual and there is no indication that its producers were ever sued for libel or false information.

Institute For American Democracy (N. Y.)

Another representative organization, operating at the national level, is also of interest here. Incorporated in New York in 1943, the Institute for American Democracy--forerunner of the present organization of the same name now operating from Washington--was apparently created by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith as a non-sectarian

³⁹Ibid., IV (January 6, 1942), 1.

vehicle for mobilizing public support against extremists. Very little is known about its early activities outside of the following:

This committee, realizing the power of advertising in America, has perfected an idea whereby advertisements sponsoring democracy can be run in newspapers, on car cards and on outdoor advertising signs, sponsored by merchants, civic or fraternal groups, or even individuals. The Institute's poster campaign has been very effective in promoting advertisements which state the simple fact that every American, regardless of his name, his color or his religion, is an American.⁴⁰

The organization, located near ADL offices in New York City, was operated by Rev. William C. Kernan, executive director, and Richard A. Zinn, public relations director. By 1949 the Institute was totally inactive and its by-laws were revised to prepare it for a period of dormancy. During the 1950's the organization was maintained as a department of B'nai B'rith, along with the Anti-Defamation League and something called the Institute for Democratic Education. Eventually IAD listed the Anti-Defamation League's address as its own while executive leadership of the dormant group was maintained by Samuel Dalsimer, chairman of the program division of ADL. Letterheads for the Institute indicate that while it was operational, it was guided chiefly by Protestant clergymen holding university teaching positions or leadership offices in the church. It is not known why ADL did not dissolve the incorporation but it is evident that, while it functioned, IAD was not a "pawn" of the B'nai B'rith,

⁴⁰Piller, op. cit., p. 175.

as some right-wing opponents of the group imply.⁴¹ Whatever the reason for maintaining it, the charter was revived in 1966 when a coalition of forces again decided to create a national non-partisan, non-sectarian, anti-extremist organization. The value of the old incorporation certificate stemmed from the tax-exempt status attached to it and carried along during the dormancy period. Using the shell of the old charter, a new organization was created which had immediate non-profit, educational status.

Group Research, Inc.

Between the demise of the Friends of Democracy in 1950 and the creation of the National Council for Civic Responsibility, a major effort at establishing a non-partisan, non-sectarian, anti-extremist organization in 1964, only one major occurrence took place in the development of the movement. In January 1962 Group Research, Inc., an independent research firm, was set up in Washington. Created and operated by Wesley McCune, this office represents the most ambitious and thorough effort ever undertaken to monitor the activities of the American right-wing. Initial funds for operating GRI came from organized labor, educational groups, and some early money from the Democrats. The operating budget has never exceeded \$50,000 and after its first years of existence, GRI

⁴¹In particular, see Church League of America, "The ADL-IADI Axis," News & Views, XXXI (November, 1968), 2-7.

has raised a large portion of its capital through the sale of a cumulative directory and subscriptions to its bi-weekly newsletter. The directory contains background information on the activities of right-wing interest groups, related individual actors, and publications. The data is documented from public records cited where appropriate. GRI has no membership, does not encourage activism, and concentrates exclusively on the rightists. A former Time-Life reporter and author, McCune is a liberal Democrat and has served as a public relations director with the National Farmers Union and was assistant to Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan during the Truman Administration.

The curious situation surrounding Group Research is the continuous over-estimate of its operations by right-wingers and the actual low publicity image GRI has sought for itself. The extremists frequently attribute a large staff of spys to GRI, estimate its budget in the six figure range, and view it as the handmaiden of their liberal enemies such as the unions, National Council of Churches, and leftist lobby groups. In fact, GRI has a very limited budget and has lately operated with some deficits. The staff has never exceeded five full-time employees and reliance is frequently placed on volunteers who are also few in number. Instead of "spys," GRI receives its information chiefly via the public press--liberal and conservative. Indeed, as McCune often notes, the American right-wing is quite boastful of its activities. Reciprocally, Group Research serves professional writers, journalists, public officials

of both parties, and government agencies at the national and state levels. Of course GRI assists some liberal groups but they do not necessarily constitute the bulk of its clients.⁴²

Only once has the role of Group Research and its activities been questioned by a reputable critic. In early October, 1965, Senator Thurston B. Morton (R-Ken.) began an attack on the John Birch Society and its influence over the Republican Party.⁴³ In the midst of this effort, Morton apparently obtained material produced by Group Research but the item which aroused his ire was the index to the GRI Directory. There he found the names of former President Eisenhower and the late Senator Estes Kefauver (D-Tenn.) included along with the names of known anti-Semites, neo-fascists, and political disreputables. At a Cleveland fundraising dinner he charged the Democratic National Committee had given GRI \$10,000 for practicing what he called "Birchism of the Left". After viewing the index, he claimed "it's the Democrats who let extremism play a major role, not Republicans. It's Democrats who support extremism, not Republicans."⁴⁴ McCune denied GRI was a "blacklist factory,"

⁴²In addition to a much publicized syndicated column of May 19, 1963, by conservative Edith Kermit Roosevelt, see the following rightist studies of Group Research: Church League of America, "Know The Enemy," News & Views, XXVI (September, 1963), 1-3; David Franke, The G. R. I. Report, American Conservative Union, Washington, D. C. (March, 1968), 36pp.; Antoni E. Gollan, "Semi-Secret Organization on the Left," New Guard, III (July, 1963), 7-8.

⁴³Associated Press account first appeared in New York Herald-Tribune, October 3, 1965.

⁴⁴New York Times, October 15, 1965.

as charged, and acknowledged the Democrats had subscribed to his service and indicated the Republicans could have done the same. Joining Morton in the attack was Gov. Mark Hatfield. In spite of the explanations, the Senator again reiterated his charge of blacklisting a few days later.⁴⁵ This second assault resulted in a six-page press statement by McCune defending GRI operations and correcting the false impressions created by Morton's charges.⁴⁶ Pointing out that Group Research had no intention or power, direct or indirect, to enforce its findings, McCune stressed the fallacy in Morton's case.

What our critics are apparently referring to is not a list but an index, and there is a very big difference. To make our 2,500-page Directory more usable, we include an index of individuals whose names appear anywhere in the material. Not only is it clearly labelled an index, but the following paragraph has appeared on the cover page of each annual revision:

"Remember that the mention of a person or organization in this Directory has no editorial significance of itself. As stated in the original instructions to the user, 'the range is broad and the inclusion of any organization, individual or publications implies no more than can be concluded from the facts set forth. The user must draw his own conclusions in each instance.' It is comparable to the index of a book."

To use any index as a list--black, white or any shading--is not only a complete misuse of research material but leads to serious mistakes and/or ridiculous conclusions. For instance, the index in Barry Goldwater's book, Why Not Victory?, "lumps together" Eisenhower and Khrushchev. Hundreds of similar examples can be found in books on public affairs.

⁴⁵Ibid., October 22, 1965.

⁴⁶For the full text see Congressional Record, CXI (October 22, 1965), 28303-06; for summaries see St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 29, 1965, Los Angeles Times, October 31, 1965.

Emphasizing that the compilation was a directory and not an encyclopedia, a difference also stressed in the books instructions to users, McCune reiterated "information contained in it does not purport to be complete but its accuracy has been carefully checked. " The remainder of the release dealt with specific personalities Morton had cited and demonstrated how the individuals in question had not been slandered. At the time, Morton or any other member of Congress might have examined the full Directory as copies were available in the Library of Congress. One contemporary press account noted about 500 subscribers received the combination newsletter-directory information while another 2,000 individuals were on a mailing list to receive the newsletter alone.⁴⁷ While no apologies were forthcoming from the attackers, neither were there any further assaults. Since the Morton incident, GRI has not drawn any serious criticism from the various right-wing organizations. A few conservatives have even cited Group Research material for its accuracy and detail. GRI remains a functioning entity today.

National Council For Civic Responsibility

When, after some fourteen years, it was again decided to create an activist anti-extremism organization, reliable and accurate information resources were already available through Group Research. While this fact was probably one impetus to creating the new organization, the more

⁴⁷St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 29, 1965.

pressing reason lay in the mounting effort of Senator Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.), an avowed conservative, to capture the presidential nomination of the Republican Party in 1964. There were those who believed a non-partisan, non-sectarian, anti-extremist organization would provide an effective vehicle for, not necessarily halting the Goldwater candidacy, reducing the involvement of the fringes of the right-wing which would be attracted to the Arizona Senator. Others saw such an organization as a convenient device to limit the Republican nominee's appeal. The differences between the two motives were subtle but very crucial.⁴⁸

The model for the new organization, called "Speaking Up For Democracy," was developed by Ruder & Finn, Inc., a New York public relations firm which has handled a number of Democratic campaign accounts. Conflicting stories are given as to whether the idea for the organization originated with party functionaries or with the public relations firm but it was, nevertheless, put together on short notice. William Ruder and Harry Levine produced a program which called for a national organization which would (1) monitor "ultra-right wing broadcasts and . . . coordinate the activities of all leading organizations answering these broadcasts," (2) "develop a full scale program to publicize the

⁴⁸These differences are important to this history as well for those with partisan motivations will certainly deny such ever existed. As will be seen, the matter is complicated further when personal ambitions entered the operation.

activities of these (right-wing) organizations through all major media, " (3) "activate support by local groups throughout the country, " and be governed by "a small select group of distinguished Americans whose credentials are unquestioned and who properly identify it as a responsible organization.⁴⁹ Ruder & Finn set about contacting "distinguished Americans" to serve in the organization. One of those who would ultimately appear among the select leadership was William Ruder himself and his firm was aware of its own role in the operation when they said:

Under less pressure, it might be possible for a program of this kind to be implemented on a gradual long-range basis. However, urgency demands that this program be moved into high gear immediately.

The task of activating the program is an ambitious one. Normally this would entail large outlays for public relations counselling fees--obviously out of the question for "Speaking Up. " Accordingly, R&F is prepared to donate two-thirds of its normal fee requirement and bill only essential out-of-pocket costs.⁵⁰

To keep costs to a manageable level it was desirable to operate the new organization as a non-profit educational institution. Not only would this mean tax-exempt status but it would also provide an aura of non-partisanship and a political status. But application for and receipt of this standing takes time, and time was precious for those desiring to make the new group a functioning entity for the ever approaching campaign of 1964. What was needed was an operational shelter and this was

⁴⁹Ruder & Finn, Inc., "Program: Speaking Up For Democracy, " Ruder & Finn, Inc., New York, New York (March 30, 1964), pp. 10, 12, 24, 25.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 27.

found in the dormant shell of the Public Affairs Institute.

Founded in 1947 through a trust agreement executed by Dewey Anderson and the late A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, the Public Affairs Institute had tax-exempt status but had lately been inoperative. Core operating funds for the first three years of the Institute's operation, amounting to \$157,597, had come from the Trainmen.⁵¹ Other supporters included the United Mine Workers, International Typographical Union, Teamsters, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, and the American Federation of Musicians.⁵² PAI's sponsors included such notable liberals as James G. Patton, Abe Fortas, J. Franklin Carter, who would later turn toward the right, Hubert Humphrey, Thurman Arnold, Chester Bowles, and Cass Canfield, among others.⁵³ Dewey Anderson, director and proprietor of the Institute, had been on the staffs of a number of New Deal panels--e.g. the Senate Small Business Committee, Board of Economic Warfare, and Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations--as well as being a member of the White House Conference on the Care of Children in a Democracy and Executive Director of the Temporary National Economic Committee, a congressional unit set up during the Roosevelt Administration to investigate monopolies.⁵⁴

⁵¹Karl Schriftgiesser, The Lobbyists (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1951), p. 187.

⁵²Ibid., pp. 134, 189.

⁵³See Ibid., pp. 190-91.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 188.

Financed by organized labor, PAI had received earmarked funds over the years for special research projects and studies on subjects of current legislative interest.⁵⁵ This activity came under the scrutiny of the Buchanan Committee in 1950 during its general investigation of lobbies and certain foundations in particular. Appearing before the committee, Anderson said:

The Public Affairs Institute operates strictly as a nonprofit research agency. It initiates its own program. It does not seek the passage or defeat of legislation by the Congress of the United States. As with . . . other similar nonprofit active educational and research organizations, the Public Affairs Institute develops specific recommendations flowing from the research and study of a problem, recommendations which may require substantive legislation and changes in public administration to be effective and to make the conclusions of the research done of practical value. We do not shrink from this use of the research technique: on the contrary, it is our means of influencing the course of events and helping to shape public policy. That is what the application of social science is all about, and it is what distinguishes a research approach from a propagandist approach to social-economic-political issues.⁵⁶

In spite of such denials, the effect of the investigation was largely negative for PAI. It was viewed with suspicion and could no longer be utilized by its financial supporters for research. Funds dwindled and PAI went into a coma. In 1964 the Institute was nothing more than a telephone number at a private home; Anderson was not even in Washington and was then contemplating running for public office. When approached

⁵⁵See Ibid., p. 190.

⁵⁶Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, House of Representatives, Lobbying Direct and Indirect: Part 7, Public Affairs Institute, 81st Congress, Second Session, (1950), pp. 4, 5.

for the use of the PAI shell with its tax-exempt standing, he consented and promptly moved back to Washington where he reopened offices, an act which served to indicate his own hopes for making the Institute and himself politically influential again.

The debut of the new organization, called the National Council for Civic Responsibility, came in late September, 1964.⁵⁷ Heading a governing committee of some 200 distinguished Americans was Dr. Arthur Larson, a registered Republican who had served in the Eisenhower Administration as Under Secretary of Labor (1954-1956), Director of the U. S. Information Agency (1956-1957), and Special Assistant to the President (1958-1961). Then Director of the World Rule of Law Center at Duke University, Larson had, only the week before, announced his support of the Johnson-Humphrey ticket. In a letter to the President he explained his position saying, in part, "I cannot support Senator Goldwater because he is either utterly unrealistic or utterly wrong on every major public issue, foreign or domestic."⁵⁸ Though he had once been severely chastised by then Senator Johnson over a USIA matter,⁵⁹ he was put to immediate use by the Democrats and the day after his letter of support

⁵⁷New York Times, September 23, 1964.

⁵⁸Ibid., September 20, 1964.

⁵⁹See Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, Lyndon B. Johnson: The Exercise of Power (New York: New American Library, 1966) pp. 184-89.

was released he was made a vice chairman of Citizens for Johnson-Humphrey.⁶⁰

Joining Larson in the leadership of the National Council for Civic Responsibility were a number of prominent figures from business, labor, organized religion, education, government and the arts. Cass Canfield and Thurman Arnold from the Public Affairs Institute sponsors joined the Council, but not Dewey Anderson. Rex Stout, once prominent in the Friends of Democracy, was also included, as were a number of notables who, together, gave the organization a non-partisan, non-sectarian quality. Offices for the NCCR were set up in New York while Anderson and his revived PAI remained in Washington. By early October NCCR was sponsoring two full-page newspaper advertisements to publicize its activities and to collect support funds.⁶¹ Following the Ruder & Finn prospectus, a broadcasting program was announced in which NCCR monitored right-wing broadcasts and prepared some eighteen reply messages to be used on many of the same stations utilizing rightist programs.⁶² Narrated by experts and public officials, the replies were circulated to

⁶⁰New York Times, September 21, 1964; Citizens for Johnson-Humphrey reported collecting \$189,694 for the campaign which is about 2.6% of the reported total \$7,034,382 collected by national level Johnson-Humphrey committees. See Herbert E. Alexander, Financing The 1964 Election (Princeton: Citizen's Research Foundation, 1966), p. 85.

⁶¹New York Times, October 8, 1964; Washington Post, October 8, 1964.

⁶²New York Times, October 18, 1964.

revitalize the broadcasting "fairness doctrine." Monitoring equipment was housed in the offices of Group Research in Washington and GRI did most of the depth research needed by NCCR as well.⁶³

Prior to its actual fund-raising drive, NCCR received between \$5,000-\$10,000 from individuals.⁶⁴ The newspaper advertisements brought another \$34,000.⁶⁵ After the Johnson landslide and the crushing defeat of Barry Goldwater, NCCR was suddenly without funds or a future. By February, 1965, the organization was finished and its epitaph written.⁶⁶ The broadcasting program ceased and its New York offices were closed. At the time, a staff of four worked for NCCR.

Few associated with the National Council for Civic Responsibility would deny the fact that lack of funds caused its collapse. But the "politics of financing" had also contributed to its demise as well. Some knowledgeable leaders of NCCR felt the Democrats had used the organization for their own purposes, and, once the election was won, had left it financially naked out in the cold world. Columnist Jack Anderson subsequently reported the Democratic National Committee had donated \$50,000 from its "book fund" and a later \$10,000 to NCCR in cash. He

⁶³Washington Evening Star, October 22, 1964; Washington Post, November 23, 1964.

⁶⁴New York Times, October 18, 1964.

⁶⁵Washington Post, February 17, 1965.

⁶⁶See: Ibid.; New York Times, February 18, 1965; "Notes in the News," The Progressive, (April, 1965), pp. 6-7.

also claimed they had arranged for Ruder & Finn to handle the NCCR fund-raising campaign. The public relations firm submitted expense vouchers to the Public Affairs Institute amounting to \$67,000, some of which mentioned the Democratic National Committee by name. PAI settled for thirty cents on the dollar but the funds from the Democrats put the Institute back in the situation of receiving politically charged revenue.⁶⁷

Some felt Ruder & Finn had been extravagant in its expenses. Others felt Dewey Anderson had accepted the R & D costs too quickly, that he had been cavalier in his own financial transactions with NCCR, and that he actually wanted to revive PAI even if at the expense of the National Council. After the announced collapse of NCCR, Anderson attempted to merge it with another group to keep it, and PAI, alive. Whatever his intentions, NCCR could not be resurrected and PAI again lapsed into dormancy. A number of individuals involved in the Council were angered and hurt over the events surrounding its collapse and many refused to involve themselves in any future attempts to again create such an anti-extremism vehicle.

The Council had been created "in response to a growing realization that there was real danger from the actions and utterances of the extremists of the Left and Right."⁶⁸ In spite of its collapse, those

⁶⁷New York Post, March 3, 1965; Washington Post, March 3, 1965.

⁶⁸National Council for Civic Responsibility, "Facing Extremism," Public Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C. (1965), p. 3.

forces of the ideological fringes still existed and were making their presence felt. The Governor of Alabama, George Wallace, was gathering momentum as a new spokesman of the American right-wing.

When NCCR came into existence, similar sub-national groups could be found in the Cleveland Committee for Civic Responsibility and Montana Citizens Rededicated. When the National Council collapsed, it left behind local groups, established at its initiative, in Wichita, Phoenix, Denver, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Portland, Seattle, Elizabeth (N. J.), Bridgeport (Conn.), Danville (Va.), Tallahassee, and Miami.⁶⁹ In 1966 a group of New Jersey citizens organized a state organization to combat extremists.⁷⁰ It was apparent that the public remained concerned about the ultras and that a national level coordination device was still desired. Eventually the Institute for American Democracy was created to meet this need.

The Institute for American Democracy (Washington, D. C.)

When launched in mid-November, 1966, the Institute for American Democracy emulated the Ruder & Finn "Speaking Up For Democracy" model and in many ways mirrored the National Council for Civic Responsibility. It was supported by a panel of forty-eight religious, labor, business and civic leaders and led by Dr. Franklin H. Littell, a Protestant

⁶⁹Washington Post, February 17, 1965.

⁷⁰New York Times, April 20, 1966.

theologian, registered Republican, and then president of Iowa Wesleyan College. He had been a student in Germany during the rise of Nazism and had personally known many of the subsequent leaders of the Protestant underground there. Later appointed a clerical adviser to the United States High Commissioner in Germany, Littell had become a well known anti-fascist in religious circles.⁷¹

Acting as executive director of the new group was Charles Baker, a public relations expert and campaign manager. After serving as a reporter with several daily papers and working with the United Auto Workers, Baker founded his own public relations firm. His accounts included the United Steel Workers, the Cleveland Committee for Civic Responsibility, and he managed Senator Stephen Young's (D-Ohio) 1964 campaign.

Among the sponsors of the organization was Dore Schary of the Anti-Defamation League, Morris Abram of the American Jewish Committee, Irvamae Applegate of the National Education Association, David Hunter of the National Council of Churches, Roy Wilkins of the N. A. A. C. P., and Walter Reuther of the UAW. Old supporters of the NCCR included Arthur Larson, Thurman Arnold, Marion B. Folsom, Jacob Blaustein, Oscar de Lima, Jacob S. Potofsky, John C. Bennett, William Haber,

⁷¹New York Times, November 19, 1966; a confidential memorandum dated August 25, 1966 and produced on the IAD letterhead but with no acknowledged author, entitled "Projected Plan of Action-Draft" echos the basic R & D program for "Speaking Up For Democracy."

George C. Lodge, Harry Ashmore, and Ralph McGill. Research support was again provided by Group Research, Inc. For a non-profit status, the Anti-Defamation League revived the old dormant New York incorporation charter of its Institute for American Democracy to create a tax-exempt shelter. Organizational publicity was handled by Maurer, Fleisher, Zon and Associates, Inc., a Washington firm with close ties to the Democratic Party.⁷² Initial operating funds were supplied by the Anti-Defamation League and the AFL-CIO.⁷³ As with the NCCR, emphasis was placed upon revitalizing the so-called "fairness doctrine" in commercial broadcasting and to that end a manual on the topic was immediately prepared and a program developed.⁷⁴

Institute Structure:

Initiated with high hopes and great ambition, IAD never really became the popular organization which its creators had hoped it would. Hampered by a bland name, the Institute failed to obtain sufficient funds to make itself known to the public. Its budget, never over \$160,000 for any one year, peaked in 1968 and funds have been declining since that

⁷²Charles R. Baker, "Annual Report for May 23rd Meeting, 1967," Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (1967), p. 10.

⁷³Charles R. Baker, Memo to IAD Board of Sponsors, January 13, 1970, n. p.

⁷⁴Charles R. Baker, "Annual Report for May 23rd Meeting, 1967," Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (1967), pp. 19-21.

time. Littell never exerted a strong influence in the group's operation and drifted away, forming a somewhat competitive group in 1967. IAD has never been able to attract a spokesman of national political repute, which has further contributed to its anonymity. The driving force behind the Institute has been Charles Baker who has been aided by a capable but transient staff, limited to no more than five full-time employees, who have no expertise on the subject of extremism. One or two part-time volunteers have provided occasional expert information and IAD has, because of its reliance on Group Research, been forced to concentrate chiefly on right-wing extremists. But even in this sphere the pressures of time and inadequate staff have resulted in the Institute frequently generating its own material, duplicating data which Group Research could also have provided. Most of the executive director's time is, therefore, taken up by the preparation of IAD's monthly newsletter, Homefront, which is produced with proficient regularity and a high degree of accuracy. Since 1968, as funds have dwindled, few, if any, new projects have been possible.

In addition to revitalizing the "fairness doctrine," IAD inherited a number of local committees which had either come into existence as a result of the NCCR or had appeared since its demise. No clear functional relationship was established at IAD's formation regarding the use or communication with these units. The Institute's whole approach to public issues was an indirect strategy, encouraging individuals and other

groups to take the leadership in combatting extremists while IAD supplied the information and targets. Thus, such local committees might have been useful, encouraged, and multiplied. In its first annual report on operations, IAD acknowledged contact with twenty-seven existing sub-national anti-extremist groups--which was almost all of them at the time--and efforts at creating four additional units.⁷⁵ A few months earlier, however, the Institute's functional relationship to these bodies had been established when it was announced that "local councils or committees committed to the Institute's Basic Principles and supporting its work are self-constituted, self-governed and self-financed."⁷⁶ In brief, IAD felt no responsibility for creating such units, desired no formal link with them, and did not view their continued operation as part of its own interest. The role which the Institute sought for itself was that of the expert which interprets the daily situation, pointing out the extremist's advances, and/or analyzing raw data supplied by individuals or groups regarding a local situation. The sub-national committees were regarded as "bloc subscription mailings" or organized collectives of individual supporters. IAD does not have formal members but subscribers, reflecting the expert information role which the Institute has sought for itself. In its second annual report on operations, IAD had no list of new local units

⁷⁵Ibid., pp. 5-7.

⁷⁶Charles R. Baker, Memo to Sponsoring Committee, February 10, 1967, p. 3.

but, instead was bemoaning the loss of several such units. On the future of such committees the report concluded:

We have just completed our Committee Handbook. We are confident that it will lead to some additional committee activity at the community level. But until such time as we can maintain a field staff, I frankly suspect the chief benefit will still be the amount of help it gives to the dedicated and often isolated individual. We have made some extensive revisions of an old draft of the manual with this in mind.⁷⁷

Thus, by the spring of its third year, IAD had practically forsaken the idea of creating new local groups. In November, 1968, it was apparent that funds were not only lacking for a field team, but that some of the Institute's established efforts would have to be cut back.⁷⁸ The Committee Handbook has been revised once since this time, largely to update factual information, but chiefly, as stated here, for continued use by "isolated individuals."⁷⁹

Educational Activities:

To disseminate its information, IAD processes four kinds of data: monthly newsletter mailings, topical research booklets, press releases, and individual requests on varied topics. The most effective of these

⁷⁷Charles R. Baker, "Annual Report for May 13th Meeting, 1968," Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (1968), p. 3.

⁷⁸Institute for American Democracy, board meeting minutes, New York, New York (November 20, 1968).

⁷⁹Institute for American Democracy, Committee Handbook, Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (1968; revised, 1969).

has probably been the newsletter, Homefront, which is produced monthly, contains a strong Institute identification, and has a growing circulation. Press releases have gone largely ignored due to IAD's low visibility, lack of a noted public spokesman, and location in the nation's capital amid a flurry of competing newsmakers. Topical research has been financially impossible since 1968 and individual requests, chiefly from private citizens, of course have no public impact.

The Institute's newsletter first appeared in February, 1967, with the first three issues being circulated free of charge to a group of potential subscribers. The mailing list was developed from membership and literature lists supplied by the Urban League, American Jewish Committee, Anti-Defamation League, and United World Federalists.⁸⁰ In efforts to build its circulation, IAD has utilized the services of at least one professional direct mail firm and has continuously attempted to build on this by trading mailing lists with a number of liberal, peace, and brotherhood organizations.⁸¹ This practice seems to explain the organ-

⁸⁰Charles R. Baker, communication to the author, October 4, 1970.

⁸¹From its beginning to the time of this survey these groups included: the American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Democratic Action, League for Industrial Democracy, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, SANE, United World Federalists, American Jewish Committee, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Political Donors of Large Sums, Fund for Education and World Order, National Committee Against Discrimination In Housing, International Rescue Committee, Southern Education Development Fund, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Southern Christian Fund, Scholarship Education and Defense Fund for

ization's growing membership but declining revenue. IAD was one of a number of groups having, among the individuals in the common potential supporter pool, very similar interests and purposes.⁸² Such persons, asked to join or assist several such organizations, apparently do so but never increase the amount of their total contribution, regardless of the number of ways it has to be divided. They give the same total amount every year, allocating it to sometimes two groups and sometimes to as many as ten. Thus, while IAD has a basic membership or subscriber fee of five dollars, a supporter can give as much as he wishes. However, because these organizations with which IAD had exchanged mailing lists were all appealing to the same individuals, these persons allocated the minimum amount which would bring them a service from each group.

In 1967, IAD had four bulk subscriptions and 615 individual subscriptions to Homefront, selling a total of 935 copies per issue. This

Racial Equality, Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, Supporters of Anti-Vietnam War Appeals, Workers Defense League, Individuals Against the Crime of Silence, National Sharecroppers Federation, National Committee for an Effective Congress, Spanish Refugee Aid Committee, U. N. I. C. E. F., United Nations Association, Urban League, Sex Education Information Council of the U. S., Amnesty International, and the Freedom Institute at Iowa Wesleyan College. Complete membership lists were not exchanged and, in most cases, probably not even partial ones. What such mailing lists usually contain are the names and addresses of individuals interested in or once affiliated with the organization in question.

⁸² Respondents in the survey were asked to indicate whether or not they supported any of these other organizations. The extent of the interlock can be found in Chapter III.

resulted in revenue of about \$5,000 for the year.⁸³ IAD's total budget for 1967 was approximately \$131,900, newsletter subscriptions supplying about three percent of these funds. The following year, the Institute counted 400 bulk subscriptions and 1,700 individual, making a total of 2,100 copies per issue distributed.⁸⁴ This yielded about \$12,900 for IAD's budget which was approximately \$154,950 in 1968, subscriptions supplying some eight percent of these funds. In 1969 subscriptions increased to 5,000.⁸⁵ Budget needs ran to \$103,400. In the spring of 1970, when the survey sample of this study was drawn, subscribers had dropped off to about 4,800. In brief, the sale of Homefront, IAD's chief self-promotion item and primary functional commodity, has not greatly contributed to the financial well-being of the organization. After 1968, when the Institute actively began its own promotion campaign via the exchanged mailing lists, subscriptions leveled off. Operating revenue has been forthcoming chiefly from supporting organizations which assist the Institute because it supplies information which they and the public are thought to need and also because contributions to it are tax-deductible, thereby providing additional incentive to support an operation

⁸³Charles R. Baker, "Annual Report for May 23rd Meeting, 1967," Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (1967), p. 8.

⁸⁴Charles R. Baker, "Annual Report for May 13th Meeting, 1968," Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (1968), p. 5.

⁸⁵Robert H. Muller, Theodore J. Spahn, and Janet M. Spahn, From Radical Left To Extreme Right (Ann Arbor: Campus Publishers, 1970), p. 161; IAD annual reports ceased after 1968.

otherwise thought beneficial. However, in the event IAD lost its tax-exempt status, or if its main supporters were to become financially pressed themselves, could the Institute survive by the sale of its own materials?⁸⁶ Clearly the answer is in the negative.

Policy Activities:

Organizational supporters of IAD are, in essence, buying research when they contribute to the Institute. In addition to the steady flow of newsletter data and background reports on topics of mementary interest, IAD has involved itself in several areas on a continuous basis. Foremost among these has been the effort to make functional and viable the Federal Communications Commission's "fairness doctrine" regarding the right of reply in cases of personal attack or misinformation. IAD has been in the vanguard of this quiet but continuous cause. After producing a manual on the subject, the Institute distributed this material to citizen and church groups interested in combatting right-wing commentators and fundamentalist preachers. Under the Institute's encouragement, advice, and indirect guidance, these units have brought challenges, filed complaints and in a case-by-case progression have made a more effective policy,

⁸⁶IAD's largest contributors have been the Anti-Defamation League and AFL-CIO, both of which are economically pressed currently due to the national economy and, in the former case, additional efforts at supporting Israel.

culminating in the recent WGCB case.⁸⁷ IAD's executive director, Charles Baker, has also taken this campaign into commercial advertising and has personally joined John Banzhaf's Action on Smoking and Health group in their efforts to curtail cigarette promotions on television.⁸⁸ In the "fairness" effort, however, IAD has not sought to eliminate broadcasts by rightists, but to force them to be responsible in their discussions and editorials. Articulating this viewpoint, Baker commented a few years ago:

When a broadcaster carries an attack on an individual's or group's honesty, character, integrity or like personal quality during the discussion of a controversial issue of public importance, he incurs a legal responsibility to inform the victim and to offer time to air the response so that the listening public may judge for itself where the truth lies.

These provisions are awkward. They can be enforced only if the victims show considerable diligence. Three years ago we inaugurated a program of responding to personal attacks on this Institute, apparently the only organization in the land to have this policy. Literally hundreds of exchanges of correspondence have been involved in our successful efforts to persuade stations to carry our replies to remarks by quite a number of call-in radio programs. Not only do most of the stations airing this material fail to notify us and other recipients of these attentions, many seem genuinely unaware of their legal obligations.

* * * * *

Clearly the public interest would be enhanced by renewal proced-

⁸⁷For details see: New York Times, June 10, 1969; Donald P. Mullally, "The Fairness Doctrine: Benefits and Costs," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXIII (Winter, 1969-1970), 579-580; according to columnist Jack Anderson, FCC Chairman Dean Burch wishes to make challenges on license renewals more difficult or seek a congressional clarification of the "fairness doctrine." See Washington Post, January 11, 1970.

⁸⁸Baker has been on the ASH Board of Sponsors since its formation in 1969.

ures which spared the licensee needless expense while assuring the public of adequate exposure to contrasting viewpoints on the vital matters which are or should be before it.⁸⁹

In addition to filing its own briefs in license renewal hearings⁹⁰ and urging others to do the same, IAD has also produced packaged responses to be aired as contrasting viewpoints by stations carrying the right-wing broadcasters.⁹¹ IAD recently recommitted itself to this task by joining in a cooperative effort with the Businessmen's Educational Fund.⁹² Syndicated under the title "In The Public Interest," these four minute commentaries by public officials and community leaders will be broadcast on two hundred stations in forty-nine states as a public service, offering a contrasting viewpoint to the ultra-right messages.⁹³ BEF chairman Harold Willens joined the Institute's Board of Sponsors at about this time as well.⁹⁴

⁸⁹Statement by Charles R. Baker, Executive Director, Institute for American Democracy [mimeo.] , submitted to United States Senate Commerce Subcommittee on Communications, December 15, 1969, pp. 9, 11.

⁹⁰See Homefront, I (October, 1967), p. 1; Ibid., II (March, 1968), p. 18; Ibid., II (October 1968), p. 70; Ibid., III (January, 1969), p. 7; Ibid., III (February, 1969), pp. 9-10; Ibid., III (March, 1969), p. 23; Ibid., III (July-August, 1969), pp. 45-46; Ibid., IV (April, 1970), p. 31; Ibid., V (February, 1971), pp. 9-11.

⁹¹Homefront, I (October, 1967), 7; Ibid., I (November, 1967), p. 7; Ibid., IV (March, 1970), 23.

⁹²For a sketch of this group see Steve Weissman, "Businessmen Against the War (Sic.)," Ramparts, IX (December, 1970), 32-37.

⁹³Homefront, V (February, 1971), p. 11; Washington Evening Star, February 15, 1971; Washington Post, February 16, 1971.

⁹⁴Homefront, V (February, 1971), 16.

While the growth of the influence of the military and its civilian confederates has also been a continuous IAD target, this interest combined with the Institute's concern with the fairness doctrine during the congressional debate on the ABM system in 1970. When the American Security Council, a primary propagandist in the ABM controversy and long considered the heart of the military-industrial complex by IAD,⁹⁵ announced plans to make available a television advertisement which purported to indicate that certain Senators did not support national defense programs with their votes. One Maryland group, Voters Opposing Tydings Re-Election, expressed interest in the film.⁹⁶ IAD developed a reasoned counter-argument on the right-of-reply in situations where the film might be used.⁹⁷ However, instead of pressing this matter before the FCC itself, the Institute turned the material over to the Task Force for Peace, headed by Harold Willens. The ultimate decision went against this group but the ASC film appeared only once.⁹⁸

One of the factors fostering the recreation of a non-partisan,

⁹⁵See Homefront, III (January, 1969), 3-4; Ibid., III (March, 1969), 18; Ibid., III (June, 1969), 39-41; Ibid., III (September, 1969), 57, 59-63; Ibid., IV (May, 1970), 33, 34-38; Ibid., IV (September, 1970), 61, 68; Ibid., IV (October, 1970), 70-71.

⁹⁶Washington Evening Star, October 18, 1970.

⁹⁷Charles R. Baker, Memo to IAD Board of Sponsors, October 28, 1970.

⁹⁸Washington Post, October 28, 1970.

non-sectarian, anti-extremist organization after the demise of the NCCR was the growing right-wing support of Alabama Governor George Wallace. While IAD kept its supporters informed of the activities of this son of the South, a more aggressive research effort was undertaken when Wallace launched his campaign for the White House in 1968. The product of this activity was a "public-service brochure" entitled "Who's Behind George? " Developed largely from information held by Group Research and similar public press data, the pamphlet documented the mounting support given to a Wallace candidacy by the American ultra right. In a five-page chart the study presented a survey of individuals and organizations of the right who were in some way linked to the Alabama governor or his campaign machinery. The cover of the twenty page brochure carried this apolitical disclaimer:

This pamphlet is not concerned with partisan politics. The IAD is an educational organization whose goal is "to provide knowledge to help safeguard democracy." We are concerned with extremist dogma. In carrying out these purposes, IAD was necessarily drawn to the extremist activities in connection with Wallace. This pamphlet contains the results of IAD's two-year study of extremism and is presented for educational purposes.⁹⁹

While the study had, in fact, been produced in a few months, it was, nevertheless, non-partisan to the extent that it seemingly favored neither of the two major parties nor their candidates. During the 1968

⁹⁹Institute for American Democracy, "Who's Behind George?, " Institute for American Democracy, Washington, D. C. (n. d.); released September 11, 1968.

campaign, however, organized labor was faced with a drift of support among their members to Wallace.¹⁰⁰ The AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education made use of some of the material in the IAD study but the United Auto Workers and International Union of Electrical Workers purchased and distributed the IAD study. Complicating any assessment of the impact of the Institute's brochure, however, was the fact that a similar, but less ambitious, study by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith was released two days after the distribution of the IAD compilation.¹⁰¹ Both of these research efforts were highlighted by a lengthy Los Angeles Times column¹⁰² and both were introduced to the House of Representatives.¹⁰³ A sixteen page document entitled "The Wallace Labor Record" and an accompanying white paper were simultaneously produced by the Southern Committee on Political Ethics.¹⁰⁴ All three efforts were independent but parallel of each other.

¹⁰⁰See Lewis Chester, Godfrey Hodgson, and Bruce Page, An American Melodrama (New York: Viking Press, 1969), pp. 705-710; Theodore H. White, The Making of the President 1968 (New York: Atheneum, 1969), pp. 425-428, 430-432.

¹⁰¹See New York Times, September 13, 1968.

¹⁰²Los Angeles Times, September 17, 1968.

¹⁰³See Congressional Record, CXIV (October 15, 1968), E9204-E9210.

¹⁰⁴SCOPE, "The Wallace Labor Record," Southern Committee on Political Ethics, Washington, D. C. (1968); SCOPE, "George C. Wallace, The Man and The Men Around Him," Southern Committee on Political Ethics, Washington, D. C. (1968).

IAD received no special funds to produce its study, which was paid for from its general operating budget. UAW did increase its 1968 contribution to the Institute by more than double its 1967 amount and the IAD budget was the largest in 1968 that it has ever been. Both UAW and IUE obtained their 8,000 copies at a bulk rate available to the general public. Of the approximately 15,000 copies of the pamphlet which were produced, less than 1,000 have been purchased by the general public. While it might be argued that this brochure was used by organized labor to urge their members back toward a long-standing support of Democratic nominees, the closeness of the 1968 presidential vote tends to indicate that part of the labor vote went to the Republicans. A Republican National Committee analysis of the election, relying on conclusions made by the Gallup polls, agreed that organized labor's support of the Democrat's presidential nominee was below that given at any time since the early days of the New Deal.¹⁰⁵

In two other issue areas, IAD has functioned in the capacity of political protector for two of its organization supporters which have come under extremist's attacks. The National Council of Churches has long been a target of the ultra right.¹⁰⁶ While parrying the continuous stream

¹⁰⁵Research Division, Republican National Committee, The 1968 Elections, Republican National Committee, Washington, D. C. (1969), p. 216.

¹⁰⁶For the history of these assaults see: Erling Jorstad, The Politics of Doomsday (Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1970); Ralph Lord Roy, Apostles of Discord (Boston: Beacon Press, 1953); Brooks R. Walker, The Christian Fright Peddlers (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1964).

of falsehoods put forth from this ideological quarter on the NCC,¹⁰⁷ the Institute also attempted, without much success, to convince the NCC that a closer look should be taken at the reparations demand made by James Foreman and signatories to the "Black Manifesto."¹⁰⁸ While the NCC arrived at no official position on the matter, individual churches generally refused to meet Foreman's demand and the drive collapsed shortly after it was inaugurated.¹⁰⁹

On the issue of sex education curricula in the public schools, IAD has disarmed attacks by the ultra right against community efforts to establish such programs in their schools and against the Sex Education Information Council of the United States.¹¹⁰ The Institute assisted in the preparation of a manual, produced by the National Education Association, which prescribed tactics for defense against extremist attacks over the sex education issue.¹¹¹ Also, both IAD and Group Research

¹⁰⁷See, for example, Homefront, II (November-December, 1968), 75; Ibid., III (January, 1969), 6; Ibid., IV (March, 1970), 17, 20-22.

¹⁰⁸See Homefront, III (June, 1969), 44; Ibid., III (September, 1969), 58.

¹⁰⁹See New York Times, August 11, 1969.

¹¹⁰See Homefront, II (November-December, 1968), 78; Ibid., III (April, 1969), 27; Ibid., III (June, 1969), 42; Ibid., III (December, 1969), p. 83.

¹¹¹See Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, National Education Association, Suggestions for Defense Against Extremist Attack: Sex Education in the Public Schools, National Education Association, Washington, D. C. (1970).

provided their expert information for a currently popular book evaluating the sex education controversy.¹¹²

The most recent issue of concern to the Institute has been in the area of internal security policy. Speaking for itself, IAD, together with Group Research, was one of the first organizations to make public comment upon the right-wing groups supporting a reinstatement of ousted State Department security officer Otto Otepka. The Institute's observation of Otepka's activities continued with a stream of reports on his ultra right connections filling the pages of Homefront.¹¹³ In March of 1969 President Nixon named Otepka to the Subversive Activities Control Board.¹¹⁴ Segments of the IAD leadership vigorously pressed to have the Institute offer public testimony on the nomination. Others responsible for IAD's policy and programs feared this action would jeopardize the organization's tax exemption. Ultimately, though drafts of testimony were prepared, it was decided that IAD would not openly enter the Senate confirmation hearings. Subsequently, the Institute made its files available to Senator Stephen Young (D. -Ohio) who, in the final hours of

¹¹²Mary Breasted, Oh! Sex Education! (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1970), pp. 216, 219, 272, 333.

¹¹³See Homefront, III (April, 1969), 25-26; Ibid., III (May, 1969), 33-36; Ibid., III (July-August, 1969), 53; Ibid., IV (April, 1970), 25-27; Ibid., IV (May, 1970), 40; Ibid., IV (June, 1970), 48; Ibid., IV (November, 1970), 77-78, 84.

¹¹⁴New York Times, March 20, 1969.

floor debate on the Otepka nomination, presented this, and other information, to his colleagues.¹¹⁵ But the data apparently came too late to exert any influence and Otepka was confirmed by a 61-28 vote.

But Otepka's term of service with the Subversive Activities Control Board was only for one year. In late 1970 President Nixon announced his intentions of renominating the highly controversial former State Department security officer again.¹¹⁶ As the new year came, many observers of the earlier nomination debate felt the White House had decided to forgo the anticipated conflict of a second confirmation. But the nomination was quietly made in late February, 1971, without public press notice. Now IAD is once again debating what role it should follow on the matter.

Whatever action the Institute takes on the Otepka nomination, it continues to face a series of operating difficulties which could force it into extinction in a matter of weeks. In the depressed economy of 1971, IAD is experiencing severe financial problems. These budget difficulties have forced the Institute to continue functioning with minimal clerical help and almost no expert assistance in probing extremist activities. IAD has not been able to cultivate a new constituency for more solvent financial support from its members. It remains the only acti-

¹¹⁵See Congressional Record, CXIV (June 24, 1969), S6998-S7037.

¹¹⁶New York Times, September 27, 1970.

vist non-partisan, non-sectarian, anti-extremist group in operation at the present time but its future is certainly most uncertain.

The Freedom Institute:

When launched in November, 1966, the Institute for American Democracy had as its chief spokesman and national chairman Dr. Franklin H. Littell, an eminent theologian, anti-fascist, and then president of Iowa Wesleyan College. Perhaps because IAD was underfinanced and had little initial public impact, Littell turned his attentions elsewhere. As an educator and college president, it was natural that he would view the university as a vehicle for alerting Americans, particularly the young, to the dangers of extremist politics. A working committee met initially in November, 1967, to consider creating an institution for this purpose but, as one of the subsequent organization's publications notes,

. . . the antecedents of the Freedom Institute date as far back as 1958. It developed from an idea of Dr. Franklin H. Littell, president of Iowa Wesleyan College, and involves the study of various political systems of America and protection of the middle ground from the radical right and left.¹¹⁷

By the fall of 1968 the Institute was beginning to function, its materials

. . . interwoven with the undergraduate program with special courses, seminars and conferences. Beginning with the 1968-1969 academic year, all students will participate in an intensive seven-week study period between the fall and spring semesters. This new "Wesleyan Plan" effectively combines the twin poles of higher

¹¹⁷Freedom Institute Newsletter, I (Winter, 1969), 3.

education: pursuit of wisdom and achievement of technical competence.¹¹⁸

While more elaborate aspects of the Institute's program were proposed and discussed at its creation, these never came into existence due to a lack of funds. Financed by a \$4,000 grant from the College, the Freedom Institute made a very small contribution to its own budget through the sale of its materials and newsletter subscriptions. A few gifts were received from sympathetic individuals but, for the most part, the Institute was economically dependent upon its parent university.¹¹⁹ By late 1969 the organization was nearing financial collapse. Early in its operation it sponsored a few public conferences, produced a text on democracy and extremism for student use, published two lengthy bibliographies, and counted four issues of its newsletter. The mailing list totaled 1,600 names.¹²⁰ This list and unsold literature was turned over to the Institute for American Democracy in late 1970 when the Freedom Institute officially ceased to function. At this time Dr. Littell served as Senior Scholar with IAD and had just joined the faculty at Temple University. With the demise of the Freedom Institute he turned his attention to the International Scholars Conference, an organization com-

¹¹⁸Freedom Institute, "The Freedom Institute," Freedom Institute, Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa (n. d.).

¹¹⁹Frank W. Wright, Project Director, Freedom Institute, letter to the author, January 19, 1970.

¹²⁰Ibid.

posed primarily of theologians, which meets annually at different locations around the United States to discuss organized religion's opposition to totalitarianism and the history of the "church struggle" during the Nazi's control of Europe. While the Freedom Institute constitutes something of a unique educational experiment, the Conference does not even concern itself with current right-wing activity in America.

Southern Committee On Political Ethics:

The candidacy of Alabama Governor George Wallace in 1968 resulted in the creation of one other anti-extremist organization. Formed in November, 1967, by liberal southerners, the Southern Committee on Political Ethics was designed to safeguard democratic practices in the states of the Old Confederacy. The group received support from labor unions, foundations, and individuals.¹²¹ Tax-exempt status was even sought but never attained due to the necessity of suspending operations after the election because of a shortage of funds.

SCOPE came into existence under the leadership of former congressman Brooks Hays but it was he and the public relations firm of Maurer, Fleisher, Zon and Associates which organized the effort and made it a reality. Though the extent of MFZ influence after the group's launching cannot be determined, the Committee utilized the firm's Washington address as its mail and office location. MFZ have handled a

¹²¹Washington Post, August 25, 1968.

number of accounts for the Democratic party but there is no evidence to indicate the Democrats were financing the operation as they did in the case of the NCCR. Joining Hays in the leadership of SCOPE, however, were former congressmen Frank Smith (D. -Miss.), Carl Elliott (D. -Ala.), and Hugo Sims (D. -S. C.). Also included were N. A. A. C. P. lobbyist Clarence Mitchell, publisher Ralph McGill of the Atlanta Constitution, editor William Baggs of the Miami Daily News, Hugh Patterson of the Little Rock Gazette, Hodding Carter of the Greenville Delta Democrat Times, and Barney Weeks, the president of the Alabama AFL-CIO Labor Council.

SCOPE produced two very similar background reports on Gov. Wallace and issued approximately sixteen monthly newsletters while it operated. Its leaders often captured newspaper space by the weight of their own personal reputations and the fact that they spoke for something called the Southern Committee on Political Ethics was lost in press reports. SCOPE had no research resources of its own and it frequently "borrowed" information from IAD or Group Research. In brief, though higher hopes were held for the organization, it rapidly became a "stop Wallace" group and, when the campaign ceased and the Alabama Governor was defeated, support and interest in SCOPE fell off as well. It never had funds for continuous operation and never succeeded in attracting a constituency. By early 1969 it suspended operations. Plans have been made on one or two occasions to merge SCOPE with IAD but nothing ever

came of the discussions. Indeed, it would seem that the Committee has little to offer except a small mailing list which is almost three years old. The group may be revived but none of the organizers seem interested in this at the moment. SCOPE exists but in a dormant state.

A recurring problem for the anti-extremist cause has been sources of funds and continuous public support or, at a minimum, interest. However, whenever one of these organizations has failed, a new one has arisen to carry on the defense function. Repeatedly the same combination of institutionalized organizations--organized labor, churches, educational associations, and civic committees--have joined in the creation of an anti-extremist vehicle. Their need is for expert information on the enemies of democracy and for some entity with the specific task of combatting these foes. There is, then, both an historical tradition and an immediate functional purpose attached to the operation of the Institute for American Democracy.

APPENDIX II.

May 27, 1970

You are one of the respondents, chosen by random sample, for inclusion in a study by Mr. Harold C. Relyea, a political science instructor at The American University in Washington D. C. Let me urge you to take a moment to answer his questionnaire when it arrives in a few days and return it in the accompanying postage-free envelope. The individual responses will be kept confidential. In point of fact, I will not see them and the reporting of the findings will be of a statistical nature, thus insuring complete anonymity for those participating.

Conducting this survey as part of his doctoral research, Mr. Relyea's study plans have been submitted to a committee of faculty members of his university, who have approved it as being well conceived, unbiased, and a study which will amplify our knowledge of the functioning of American democracy. All costs of this mailing are being defrayed by a grant Mr. Relyea has received to pursue his dissertation. If you have any questions regarding your role in this research you may write to Mr. Relyea at The American University, School of Government and Public Administration, Washington D. C. 20016 or call 202-244-6800, ext. 666.

A reliable, conscientious and exceedingly thorough young man, Mr. Relyea was on IAD's staff last year. We know him as a magnificent person and a sensitive student of democracy who has already published in political science journals.

I am particularly delighted that Mr. Relyea has chosen this subject area for his doctoral dissertation. With your help, he will provide a substantial addition to our body of knowledge in this area of our mutual concern.

Sincerely,

Charles R. Baker
Executive Director

CRB:seg.

June 7, 1970

A few weeks ago you probably filled out a questionnaire for the national census. Such surveys provide public officials and social scientists essential information for creating public policy. This basic data is not, however, sufficient to understand the functioning of a democracy like the United States. In the last few years a number of political scientists have engaged in studies which will tell us more about the opinions and political behavior of the American people. To understand the alert and articulate citizen, so essential for the functioning of any democratic system, we are focusing our research upon these essential ingredients of belief and action.

Assisting in this research is an organization dedicated to the preservation and understanding of the democratic process. The Institute for American Democracy has allowed us to survey those people who have associated themselves with its operations and efforts at safeguarding democracy. A number of members of the Institute are being asked to cooperate in this research. You have been selected to be one of the respondents. The questions which are being asked in this study do not require any special knowledge. Your honest and considered views are requested. There are no right or wrong answers--what counts are your own views and feelings about these things. Of course, your name will never be revealed to anyone; all of your answers will be strictly confidential. The final report will be statistical in nature, showing how many people answered each question in one way or another. Once the questionnaire is completed, the responses are identified by a code number only, thus insuring that your views remain completely anonymous. I. A. D. will have no special access to any data collected. The final public report will be made available simultaneously to both the Institute and interested members.

Many of you will be going on vacations soon so I would recommend that the questionnaire be filled out and returned within about a week after you have received it. Glance through it and then complete it. I hope you find it interesting as you examine your own political history. Please do not give it to someone else to finish. Also, please try to fill it out as fully as possible. I will begin processing the information as soon as you return your questionnaire. A return envelope with postage is provided.

This research can provide significant information about a group of Americans highly concerned about the politics of their country. You are a part of that group. Your assistance is needed and, of course, most gratefully appreciated.

Thank you,

Harold C. Relyea

CONFIDENTIALINSTITUTE FOR AMERICAN DEMOCRACYInstructions for completing this questionnaire:

1. Your full cooperation is sincerely requested in this research. You will be aiding a systematic study of an area of behavior vitally important to democratic government. It is important that you answer each question below and in as much detail as possible.
2. If you wish to make any marginal comments on the questions, please feel free to do so. Such comments are often very helpful in interpreting data.
3. There is a serial number in the lower left-hand corner of this first page. When this questionnaire has been returned, this portion will be ripped off of the body of the questionnaire and the number will be checked off the master-list to indicate that the particular questionnaire has been completed and returned. This number is a mechanical device only, to check the response-rate; it serves no other purpose. Once checked off, the number will not be further associated with either your name or with the data of the questionnaire.
4. We reiterate that this is a scientific study; we promise to respect in full the confidential nature of the information you supply; and we specifically request that you DO NOT SIGN this questionnaire schedule.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Harold C. Relyea

Number: _____

1. First, we would like to know if you think there are any major differences between the Republicans and the Democrats these days. That is, do you think the two parties differ nationally, and if so, what do they differ about?

2. Would you say that either one of the parties is more liberal than the other?

No _____; Yes _____

- a) if "Yes," please check one: _____ Republicans much more liberal
 _____ Republicans more liberal
 _____ Democrats more liberal
 _____ Democrats much more liberal

3. What would you say are the most important problems facing the administration and Congress today? (Please indicate as many as you feel are major problems, numbering them in their order of importance.)

- a) Now, taking the most important problem you have indicated, what action would you like to see taken on that matter?

- b) Taking the second most important problem you have indicated, what action would you like to see taken on that matter?

- c) Returning to the most important problem you have indicated, can you state the position of I. A. D., if it has one, on this matter? No position _____; Has a position, but I cannot state it _____; Has a position which is _____

- d) If I. A. D. has no policy on this problem, do you think it should adopt a position? No ____; Yes ____
- e) If I. A. D. has a policy on this problem, are you in basic agreement with it? No ____; Yes ____
- f) Similarly, taking the second most important problem you have indicated, can you state the position of I. A. D., if it has one, on this matter? No position ____; Has a position, but I cannot state it ____; Has a position which is: _____
-

- g) If I. A. D. has no policy on this problem, do you think it should adopt a position? No ____; Yes ____
- h) If I. A. D. has a policy on this problem, are you in basic agreement with it? No ____; Yes ____

4. Here are some statements frequently heard on current issues. In each case we would like to know what your opinion is.

- a) If you happened to hear about what went on between the police and demonstrators in Chicago at the Democratic convention, do you think the police used too much force, the right amount of force, or not enough force with demonstrators?

Did not hear about what went on ____
 Too much force ____
 Right amount of force ____
 Not enough force ____
 Don't know ____

- b) "It would be desirable to have a realignment of the two parties so that one was clearly liberal and the other clearly conservative. "

Agree strongly ____
 Agree but not very strongly ____
 Don't know ____
 Disagree but not very strongly ____
 Disagree strongly ____

- c) "George Wallace's American Independent Party should never be allowed a position on the ballot. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- d) "In spite of what some say, Communist countries are working together to destroy the United States and must be stopped. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- e) "Something should be done to get recorded telephone messages, like those of Let Freedom Ring!, off the air and kept off. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- f) "Persons favoring sex education courses in our public schools should be closely scrutinized concerning their own political and moral behavior. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- g) "For the most part, the Supreme Court under Earl Warren served the highest principles of democracy. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- h) "If a person should happen to be attacked in a radio or television broadcast, he has no special right to free reply time but should buy time to respond just like any other advertiser. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- i) "With the possible exception of major wars, the national budget should be balanced every year. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- j) "The United States should not have signed the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- k) "Communist China should probably be admitted to the United Nations and the United States should not oppose this. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- l) "This country would be better off if the Federal Income Tax were abolished. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- m) Our government's present policy of "Vietnamizing" the Vietnam war calls for a gradual withdrawal of American troops. Is this policy satisfactory to you, in your view of the Vietnam situation, or should we be doing something else?

Present policy satisfactory _____
 Immediate total removal of all troops _____
 Rapid removal of combat troops but leave advisers _____
 Increase our combat forces and the fighting _____
 Don't know _____

5. Next we would like to know your opinion of various groups in American society and politics. With regard to your own general political position, how would you rate each group on the five point scale below? Do you agree with these groups, do you welcome their support, etc.? Place a check-mark or "x" on the proper place on the group-continuum to indicate your evaluation of each group.

Groups	Strongly dislike -2	Dislike -1	Neutral 0	Like +1	Strongly like +2	Not familiar with
<u>N. A. A. C. P.</u>						
<u>Am. Civil Liberties Union</u>						
<u>S. D. S.</u>						
<u>C. O. R. E.</u>						
<u>Sex. Ed. Information Council</u>						
<u>Chamber of Commerce</u>						
<u>National Farmers Union</u>						
<u>Black Panthers</u>						
<u>Americans for Const'l Action</u>						
<u>Unitarians</u>						
<u>American Jewish Committee</u>						
<u>Liberty Lobby</u>						
<u>Nat. Assoc. of Manufacturers</u>						
<u>United Auto Workers</u>						

Groups	Strongly dislike -2	Dislike -1	Neutral 0	Like +1	Strongly like +2	Not familiar with
<u>American Legion</u>						
<u>Nat. Right-to-Work Comm.</u>						
<u>Sierra Club</u>						
<u>League for Industrial Democracy</u>						
<u>Americans for Democratic Action</u>						
<u>Progressive Labor Party</u>						
<u>Farm Bureau Federation</u>						
<u>S. A. N. E.</u>						
<u>Young Americans for Freedom</u>						
<u>American Security Council</u>						

6. Now suppose that a Cuban agent of Fidel Castro's has come to your home community to enlist the sympathies of the Negro sub-community; and

a) suppose that he wishes to use a public school auditorium for his rally. Should he be allowed to use a public facility or not?

yes _____
undecided _____
no _____

b) suppose that he wishes to speak on a street corner for his rally. Should he be granted a police permit or not?

yes _____
undecided _____
no _____

c) suppose that he wishes to purchase radio-television time for his address. Should the local station manager permit him to buy time?

yes _____
undecided _____
no _____

- d) suppose this Cuban agent holds a meeting and a group of citizens has organized to picket it. The group asks you to join: would you join them or not?

yes _____
 undecided _____
 no _____

7. A union member has been summarily expelled from his union because of his views on "right-to-work" legislation. A legal defense committee has been set up to aid his court appeals and this committee has asked you for your cooperation. Would you support, ignore, or oppose this committee?

support _____
 ignore _____
 oppose _____

- a) why would you do that? _____

8. The son of a friend has won a substantial scholarship to a famous university that he wants to attend. He needs this scholarship in order to attend--but acceptance requires that he sign an affidavit that he will not participate in any campus protest activity and that he will lose the needed funds if he does get involved in such demonstrations. He comes to you for advice. What advice would you give him and why would you give him that advice? _____

9. The following are a series of questions concerning social viewpoint, family opinions, and individual outlook. With each statement simply indicate how it corresponds to your own view by noting the extent of agreement or disagreement.

- a) "It is only when a person devotes to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- b) "Most people can generally be trusted. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- c) "Of all the different philosophies which exist in the world there is probably only one which is correct. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- d) "Human nature is fundamentally cooperative. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- e) "Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- f) "What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- g) "To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our side. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- h) "If you don't watch yourself, people will take advantage of you. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- i) "In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- j) "Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

- k) "If it weren't for the rebellious ideas of youth there would be less progress in the world. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

In the following series of questions we would like to explore your political activity and voting habits over the last few years. Try to recall the information as accurately as you can.

10. In the 1964 presidential election, did you vote for Goldwater or Johnson?

Voted for Goldwater _____
 Voted for Johnson _____
 Not eligible to vote _____
 Eligible but unable to vote _____
 Don't remember _____

11. In 1960, did you vote for John Kennedy or Richard Nixon?

Voted for Kennedy _____
 Voted for Nixon _____
 Not eligible to vote _____
 Eligible but unable to vote _____
 Don't remember _____

12. How about 1956? In 1956 did you vote for Eisenhower or Stevenson?

Voted for Eisenhower _____
 Voted for Stevenson _____
 Not eligible to vote _____
 Eligible but unable to vote _____
 Don't remember _____

13. Prior to the Republican convention in 1968, who would you have preferred to see the Republicans nominate for President?

Preferred Rockefeller _____
 Preferred Nixon _____
 Preferred Percy _____
 Preferred Hatfield _____
 Preferred Romney _____
 Preferred Reagan _____
 Indifferent _____
 Other: _____ (specify)

14. Prior to the Democratic convention in 1968, who would you have preferred to see the Democrats nominate for President?

Preferred Johnson _____
 Preferred Humphrey _____
 Preferred McCarthy _____
 Preferred Robert Kennedy _____
 Preferred McGovern _____
 Indifferent _____
 Other: _____ (specify)

15. Who did you vote for in 1968?

Voted for Humphrey _____
 Voted for Nixon _____
 Voted for Wallace _____
 Not eligible to vote _____
 Eligible but unable to vote _____
 Abstained from presidential voting _____
 Other: _____ (specify)

16. As you remember it, for which party did your father usually vote in presidential elections when you were young?

Democratic _____
 Republican _____
 Independent _____
 Other party (specify): _____
 Other answer (specify): _____

17. In general, during the past ten years, in voting for candidates for Congress, for statewide offices, and for President, would you say your votes were . . .

All or mostly Republican _____
 Split but more Republican than Democratic _____
 Split evenly _____
 Split but more Democratic than Republican _____
 All or mostly Democratic _____
 Other (specify): _____

18. Regardless of how you voted in the last few elections, how have you usually thought of yourself--as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?

Democrat _____
 Republican _____
 Independent _____
 Other (specify): _____

a) if either "Democrat" or "Republican," would you consider yourself a strong party member or not so strong a party member?

strong _____ Not so strong _____

b) if "Independent," do you feel you lean more toward one party than the other?

lean Democratic _____
 lean Republican _____
 neither _____

In a society as large and complex as ours, there are many ways to engage in political activity. In the next series of questions, we would like to get a profile of the full range of your political behavior over the past ten years (1960-1970).

19. (1) Voting

- a) since January of 1960, have you voted in primary elections?
No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," when and in what party primary?

- b) have you voted in local elections? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," when and generally for what party's candidates?

(2) Party work

- a) have you contributed money to party organizations? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," when, which party, and approximately how much was given?

- b) have you contributed money directly to specific candidates or their committees? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," when, what candidates (i. e., party and office-level), and approximately how much was contributed?

- c) worked for nomination of a candidate? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," when, what candidates (i. e., party and office-level), and what did you do?

- d) worked for election of candidates? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," when, what candidates (i. e., party and office-level), and what did you do?

- e) done other party work? (Please specify when, which party, and what was done--e.g., campaign strategist for congressman, policy advisor on labor legislation to gubernatorial candidate, etc.)
No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," when, what candidate(s), etc.
-
-

(3) Policy or issue work

- a) since January, 1960, have you written, telegraphed, telephoned, or visited public office holder(s) on a problem or pending issue?
No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," when, what issue(s), and whom did you contact (i. e., party and office-level)?
-
-

- b) have you written or telegraphed newspapers or magazines on an issue or problem? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," when, what issue(s), and what newspapers/magazines?
-
-

- c) belonged to organization(s) taking stands on parties, candidates, or issues? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," what organizations?
-
-

- d) Consider the amount of time you have spent in political activities over the past ten years. What percentage of this time have you spent in anti-war (Vietnam) or peace activity? (giving money, time, assistance, etc.)

100-75% ____
75-50% ____
50-25% ____
25-10% ____
almost none ____
none ____

- (1) Did you attend the National Mobilization Anti-War Rally in Washington on November 15th? Yes ____; No ____

- (2) Did you attend the National Anti-War Rally in Washington on May 9th, following American entry into Cambodia? Yes _____
No _____

(4) Office holding

- a) since 1960, have you sought or held a party office? No _____;
Yes _____; if "Yes," when, what party, what office, and were
you successful each time?

- b) sought nomination to public office? No _____; Yes _____; if "Yes,"
what party, what office, when, and were you successful each time?

- c) sought election to public office? No _____; Yes _____; if "Yes,"
what party, what office, when, and were you successful each time?

- d) held office in a non-party organization taking stands on parties,
candidates, or issues? No _____; Yes _____; if "Yes," what
office(s), when, and what organization(s)?

- e) held an appointive public office? No _____; Yes _____; if "Yes,"
who appointed you, when, and to what office(s)?

20. In general, how interested are you in national domestic politics?

Greatly interested _____
Quite interested _____
Moderately interested _____
Not much interested _____
Don't know _____

21. In general, how interested are you in international politics and affairs?

Greatly interested _____
Quite interested _____
Moderately interested _____
Not much interested _____
Don't know _____

22. How would you compare your interest in state-local politics and affairs with your interest in other political matters? That is, compared with your interest in national and international politics and affairs, would you say your interest in state-local politics and affairs is . . .

Much more _____
 A little more _____
 About the same _____
 A little less _____
 Much less _____
 Don't know _____

23. These next questions concern your organizational memberships:

- a) in your community, how active would you say you are in business, civic, political, and social organizations?

Very active _____
 Moderately active _____
 Slightly active _____
 Inactive _____

- b) during your lunches and non-working hours, how frequently are you engaged in the meetings and activities, etc., of these various organizations?

Very frequently _____
 About half the time _____
 Very infrequently _____
 Never _____

- c) if you could belong to only one such business, civic, political, or social organization, which one would you choose?

_____ (name)

Why would you choose this one? _____

- d) which of the following are most important to you? Choose as many as you feel are very important, numbering them in terms of their importance to you.

Religious group _____	Political party _____	Nationality _____
Local community _____	Union _____	Occupation or _____
Race _____	Work group _____	Profession _____

The next series of questions focuses on your image of and relations with the Institute for American Democracy (which we will refer to as IAD). Again, answer each question as clearly and as best you can. We want your considered opinions.

24. Can you recall how and when you first heard of the Institute for American Democracy? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," when was that and what were the specific details?

- a) can you recall your first contact with anyone identified with IAD? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," when was that and what were the details?

- b) was this first contact also the time of your first contribution to IAD, either to obtain membership or provide support? No ____; Yes ____

- c) would you say of this first contact that it was . . .

Initiated by you ____
 Initiated by someone in IAD ____
 Initiated by someone else ____

- d) have you ever attended any meetings run by IAD? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," when and where was that?

- f) Perhaps you have been, or are now, affiliated with some organization similar to IAD. If you have been connected with one of the groups listed below, or with a group you feel was or is similar to IAD, give your years of affiliation.

Friends of Democracy ____
 National Council for Civic Responsibility ____
 Southern Committee on Political Ethics ____
 Anti-Defamation League ____
 American Jewish Committee ____
 Non-Sectarian, Anti-Nazi League ____
 Freedom Institute (Iowa Wesleyan College) ____
 Other (specify): ____

25. Have you ever called the existence of IAD to the attention of anyone? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," please indicate the relationship of the individual(s) to you (brother, nephew, aunt, family doctor, friend at work, boss, etc.)

 (1) if non-family, how well do you know them? _____

(2) have you ever suggested to anyone that he or she should contribute to or join IAD? No ____; Yes ____

26. Can you recall when and why you first contributed to IAD? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," what are the specific details as you recall them?

 a) have you contributed more than once (including membership fees) to IAD? No ____; Yes ____

(1) if "No," is there any particular reason for this? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," what is that? _____

(2) if "Yes," then . . .

(a) how many times have you contributed? ____ (Times)

(b) what has your contribution averaged? ____ (Average)

(c) have you also contributed to other, non-party political groups in this same period? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," what are these other groups?

 (d) for the period in which you have contributed to IAD, approximately how much was the contribution of your total annual political contributions?

100% of it ____
 75-99% ____
 50-74% ____
 25-49% ____
 under 25% ____

27. Have you ever communicated with either staff or members of IAD (other than to send a financial contribution)? No ____; Yes ____; if "Yes," please indicate when, with whom, and the subject(s) of such communication. _____

28. On the average, how thoroughly do you read material mailed to you by IAD?

I read (almost) every word _____
 I read most of it _____
 I just scan it _____
 Don't know _____

29. Do you read the IAD newsletter, "Homefront?" No _____; Yes _____;
 if "Yes, " . . .

a) do you think it accurate? No _____ Yes _____

b) do you think it is intelligent? No _____ Yes _____

c) do you think it is useful? No _____ Yes _____

d) do you think it shows any particular bias? No _____ Yes _____
 if "Yes, " what is that bias _____

- e) and compared with your other major sources of political information and interpretation, would you say "Homefront" is . . .

(1) More accurate? _____
 Equally accurate? _____
 Less accurate? _____
 Don't know _____

(2) More useful? _____
 Equally useful? _____
 Less useful? _____
 Don't know _____

(3) Closer to your own opinions? _____
 Equally close to your opinions? _____
 Less close to your own opinions? _____
 Don't know _____

30. IAD and its members oppose "extremism. " What does "extremism" mean to you?

31. In your opinion, the emphasis of IAD's anti-extremism is chiefly directed against . . .

the extreme right-wing _____
 the extreme left-wing _____
 black nationalists _____

both left and right _____
 leftists, rightists, and black nationalists _____
 other: _____
 don't know _____

32. In general, is there anything that IAD is not doing now that you would like to have it do? No _____; Yes _____; if "Yes," what is that?

33. How do you feel about this statement: "The principles of IAD are similar to the social theology principles of my religion. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

34. Do you think it would make any difference to the country if IAD ceased to exist? No _____ Yes _____

a) Why do you think that? _____

35. Would it make any difference to you personally if IAD ceased to exist? No _____ Yes _____

a) Why do you think that? _____

36. Would you object to a Communist joining IAD? No _____ Yes _____

a) Why? _____

37. Is it possible that any Communists are now members of IAD? No _____ Yes _____

a) Why? _____

38. Is it possible that any right-wing extremists are members of IAD? No _____; Yes _____

a) Why? _____

39. How do you feel about this statement: "IAD and the organized labor (union) movement stand for the same goals. "

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

40. Of all of your political activities and associations, how important to you is IAD?

Very important _____
 Moderately important _____
 Slightly important _____
 Unimportant _____

41. Do you feel that you belong to the Institute for American Democracy?
 No _____; Yes _____

a) if "No," do you feel that you belong to any political (including party) group or organization? No _____; Yes _____; if "Yes," which ones?

b) if "Yes," do you have this same sense of belonging to any other political (including party) group or organization? No _____; Yes _____; if "Yes," . . .

(1) which ones: _____

(2) is this sense of belonging to IAD stronger than you feel for these other organizations, about the same strength, or weaker?

Stronger _____
 About the same _____
 Weaker _____
 Don't know _____

42. How do you feel about this statement: "The objectives of IAD are sympathetic to efforts to provide broad-based education in our public schools."

Agree strongly _____
 Agree but not very strongly _____
 Don't know _____
 Disagree but not very strongly _____
 Disagree strongly _____

This concludes the questions on politics. The remaining questions are some routine biographical items which tell us something about those who are participating in this study. Such information, though somewhat personal, is necessary for meaningful statistical analysis of the opinion and action data you have already provided. Please remember, all information is CONFIDENTIAL.

43. What is the population of your present place of residence? _____

- a) What state do you presently reside in? _____
- b) How long have you lived in your present community? _____(years)
44. How old are you? _____(years, age last birthday)
45. Please indicate your sex: Male _____ Female _____
46. Please indicate your present marital status: Single _____
 Married _____
 Widowed _____
 Divorced or _____
 Separated _____
47. Have you any children? No _____; Yes _____; if "Yes," how many? _____
48. What is your religion? Protestant _____ and denomination _____
 Roman Catholic _____
 Jewish _____
 Other (specify): _____
 None _____
- a) do you attend your church or synagogue . . . Regularly _____
 Occasionally _____
 Almost never _____
49. What was your father's occupation when you were in your teens? (if your father had died, what had been his occupation?)

- a) did your father work for himself (____) or was he employed by someone else (____)?
- b) was he a union member? No _____ Yes _____
50. What is your occupation? (please note these directions: [a] if you are now retired, please indicate "retired" and then what your occupation was; [b] if you are married or a widowed housewife, please indicate "housewife" and then what your husband's occupation is or was; [c] if you are married and a working woman, please indicate both your own and husband's occupations, labeling each; and [d] if you are a single, separated, or divorced or widowed working woman, then please indicate your own occupation; please indicate all occupational functions and all titles in as much detail as possible, without indicating the name of your particular employer, firm, etc.

The remainder of this question applies only if it is--or was--your own occupation you are answering about:

- a) how many years have you been engaged in this occupation?
_____ (years)
- b) have you ever been engaged in a different occupation? No _____;
Yes _____; if "Yes," what was it? (title, functions, etc., but
not employer's name).
-
- c) how many employees are there at your place of employment?
_____ (number)
- d) in your work, are you self-employed (____) or are you employed
by someone else (____)?
- e) are you a union member? No _____ Yes _____
- f) have you ever been a union member? No _____; Yes _____; if
"Yes," how long were you a member _____ (years)
51. Are you a war veteran? No _____ Yes _____
- a) if "Yes," of which war or wars? _____
- b) were you overseas for three months or more while in service?
No _____; Yes _____
52. Where was your father born? (city and state, U. S. or foreign country)
-
53. Where was your father's father born? (city and state, U. S. or for-
eign country)
-
54. Of what race do you consider yourself to be? black _____ white _____
Other (specify): _____
-
55. Please check the last year of school completed:
- | | |
|----------------------|-------|
| Some grammar school | _____ |
| Grammar school grad. | _____ |
| Some high school | _____ |
| High school grad. | _____ |
| Some college | _____ |
| College graduate | _____ |
| Some post-graduate | _____ |
| Post-graduate grad. | _____ |

- a) if you attended "some college" or more, please indicate the school names and also degrees earned:

56. Approximately what is your current annual income from all sources?

Above \$100,000 _____
 \$50,000-99,999 _____
 \$40,000-49,999 _____
 \$30,000-39,999 _____
 \$25,000-29,999 _____
 \$20,000-24,999 _____
 \$15,000-19,999 _____
 \$10,000-14,999 _____
 \$ 5,000- 9,999 _____
 Below \$5,000 _____

- a) over the past three years, would you say that your annual income has changed significantly? No _____ Yes _____; if "Yes," how has it changed--that is, how much has it changed and in what direction?

_____ % (percentage of change) _____ (direction)

Dear respondent:

The information you have provided here will be processed on information storage cards designed for data processing. The subsequent analysis will be of a statistical nature. What we will obtain here is a profile of a group of active and dedicated people who participate in the American democratic processes and who also happen to be members of an organization known as the Institute for American Democracy.

A free and open society allows social and political scientists to explore the opinions and political activities of the citizenry. The Institute for American Democracy, believing in this freedom and anxious to assist in studies of the democratic process, has greatly assisted in this research by permitting a survey of a sample of its membership. No such undertaking as this would be possible, however, without the individual and personal cooperation

of each citizen contacted. I would like to thank you most sincerely for your assistance, understanding, and forbearance. Certainly this study could not be completed without your help and kindness. Once again, all information provided by you and your fellow members will be treated in strict confidence.

Respectfully,

Harold C. Relyea

August 10, 1970

Dear respondent,

A little over a month ago you should have received a copy of my questionnaire which was sent to a random sample of members of the Institute for American Democracy. Many who received them have already completed them. My record of respondent numbers indicates that I have not, however, received your completed questionnaire as yet. Perhaps it is in the mail and already finished. Maybe yours never arrived and you would drop me a note indicating you need one. If it is lost I will be glad to send you another.

Let me restate once again that this project is not connected with the Institute for American Democracy and that your responses are confidential. No one connected with I. A. D. will ever see these questionnaires and since the returned responses have only an identification number on the cover, no one ever associates your answer with your name. This research utilizes the techniques of social science and is under the supervision of an accredited university and its faculty. I am interested in the collective opinions and attitudes of a group. You are part of that group and I urge you to return your questionnaire as soon as possible.

I will begin processing the questionnaires very soon--placing the individual responses on computer cards. In order to have a good sample, and a statistically valid one, I need to have many more of you return your responses to me. Don't depend upon the other members to provide the data--your opinions are the ones I need. Many of you have been away on vacation, I know, but I hope you will find an opportunity to complete the questionnaire in the days ahead.

Once again may I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to you for cooperating and assisting in this research project.

Cordially,

Number: _____

SEP 2 1970

Dear respondent:

Due to matters of health, insufficient time, or non-delivery, some of you were unable to complete the initial questionnaire sent out to a selected random sample of individuals associated with the Institute for American Democracy. My study is about to conclude but before final tabulation of the information I wish to provide one final opportunity for you to participate if you have not been able to do so thus far.

Your cooperation is sincerely requested and most essential in this research. My study is being conducted through an accredited university, under the guidance of its most capable faculty, and utilizes techniques of social science. I am attempting to know more about the opinions and activities of a group of people affiliated with the Institute for American Democracy. No individual is singled out for discussion but, rather, the attitudes and behavior of the group is statistically analyzed. What emerges is a profile of a group dedicated to making democracy work. The Institute is assisting in my research but will have access to no single questionnaires and will be given final results only. These findings will be passed along to you and the other members of I. A. D. through its newsletter, Homefront.

This letter has a short form of my original questionnaire attached to it. If you have an opportunity to fill this out and return it before the end of the month, it will be most appreciated and also will be included in the data pool. You will note that an identification number appears on this letter, enabling me, at this point, to prevent duplications of respondents. This number continues to be a mechanical device only. At the end of this month, when this data is being placed on computer storage cards, my master list of participants will be destroyed and identification numbers will only serve to prevent mix-ups in these data cards. The number not only will no longer be associated with anyone's name, it will be impossible to even trace it should anyone wish to so do.

This is a scientific study using procedures like those of any national opinion poll. The confidential nature of the information you supply is respected and processed according to the anonymity conditions described above. You should not sign this questionnaire schedule or indicate your address on it or the stamped return envelope provided. Your assistance, patience, and cooperation is most appreciated. I have

been most fortunate to have worked with a group of Americans such as this one who are both knowledgeable and sympathetic with the purposes of this study.

Cordially,

Harold C. Relyea

Number: _____

6. Now suppose that a Cuban agent of Fidel Castro's has come to your home community to enlist the sympathies of the Negro sub-community; and

a) suppose that he wishes to use a public school auditorium for his rally. Should he be allowed to use a public facility or not?

yes _____
undecided _____
no _____

b) suppose that he wishes to speak on a street corner for his rally. Should he be granted a police permit or not?

yes _____
undecided _____
no _____

c) suppose that he wishes to purchase radio-television time for his address. Should the local station manager permit him to buy time?

yes _____
undecided _____
no _____

d) suppose this Cuban agent holds a meeting and a group of citizens has organized to picket it. The group asks you to join: would you join them or not?

yes _____
undecided _____
no _____

7. A union member has been summarily expelled from his union because of his views on "right-to-work" legislation. A legal defense committee has been set up to aid his court appeals and this committee has asked you for your cooperation. Would you support, ignore, or oppose this committee?

support _____
ignore _____
oppose _____

a) why would you do that? _____

8. The son of a friend has won a substantial scholarship to a famous university that he wants to attend. He needs this scholarship in order to attend--but acceptance requires that he sign an affidavit that he will not participate in any campus protest activity and that he will lose the needed funds if he does get involved in such demonstrations. He comes to you for advice. What advice would you give him and why would you give him that advice?
-

10. In the 1964 presidential election, did you vote for Goldwater or Johnson?

Voted for Goldwater _____
Voted for Johnson _____
Not eligible to vote _____
Eligible but unable to vote _____
Don't remember _____

11. In 1960, did you vote for John Kennedy or Richard Nixon?

Voted for Kennedy _____
Voted for Nixon _____
Not eligible to vote _____
Eligible but unable to vote _____
Don't remember _____

12. How about 1956? In 1956 did you vote for Eisenhower or Stevenson?

Voted for Eisenhower _____
Voted for Stevenson _____
Not eligible to vote _____
Eligible but unable to vote _____
Don't remember _____

13. Prior to the Republican convention in 1968, who would you have preferred to see the Republicans nominate for President?

Preferred Rockefeller _____
Preferred Nixon _____
Preferred Percy _____
Preferred Hatfield _____
Preferred Romney _____
Preferred Reagan _____
Indifferent _____
Other: _____ (specify)

14. Prior to the Democratic convention in 1968, who would you have preferred to see the Democrats nominate for President?

Preferred Johnson _____
 Preferred Humphrey _____
 Preferred McCarthy _____
 Preferred Robert Kennedy _____
 Preferred McGovern _____
 Indifferent _____
 Other: _____ (specify)

15. Who did you vote for in 1968?

Voted for Humphrey _____
 Voted for Nixon _____
 Voted for Wallace _____
 Not eligible to vote _____
 Eligible but unable to vote _____
 Abstained from presidential voting _____
 Other: _____ (specify)

16. As you remember it, for which party did your father usually vote in presidential elections when you were young?

Democratic _____
 Republican _____
 Independent _____
 Other party (specify): _____
 Other answer (specify): _____

17. In general, during the past ten years, in voting for candidates for Congress, for statewide offices, and for President, would you say your votes were . . .

All or mostly Republican _____
 Split but more Republican than Democratic _____
 Split evenly _____
 Split but more Democratic than Republican _____
 All or mostly Democratic _____
 Other: _____

18. Regardless of how you voted in the last few elections, how have you usually thought of yourself--as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?

Democrat _____
 Republican _____
 Independent _____
 Other (specify): _____

- a) if either "Democrat" or "Republican," would you consider yourself a strong party member or not so strong a party member?

strong _____ not so strong _____

- b) if "Independent," do you feel you lean more toward one party than the other?

lean Democratic _____

lean Republican _____

neither _____

23. These next questions concern your organizational memberships:

- a) in your community, how active would you say you are in business, civic, political, and social organizations?

Very active _____

Moderately active _____

Slightly active _____

Inactive _____

- b) if you could belong to only one such business, civic, political, or social organization, which one would you choose?

_____ (name)

Why would you choose this one? _____

- d) Which of the following are most important to you? Choose as many as you feel are very important, numbering them in terms of their importance to you.

Religious group _____ Political party _____ Nationality _____

Local community _____ Union _____ Occupational or

Race _____ Work group _____ professional group _____

24. Can you recall how and when you first heard of the Institute for American Democracy (IAD)? No _____; Yes _____; if "Yes," when was that and what were the details?

- c) would you say this first contact was . . .

Initiated by you _____

Initiated by someone in IAD _____

Initiated by someone else _____

- f) Perhaps you have been, or are now, affiliated with some organization similar to IAD. If you have been connected with one of the groups listed below, or with a group you feel was or is similar to IAD, give your years of affiliation.

Friends of Democracy _____
 National Council for Civic Responsibility _____
 Southern Committee on Political Ethics _____
 Anti-Defamation League _____
 American Jewish Committee _____
 Non-sectarian, Anti-Nazi League _____
 Freedom Institute (Iowa Wesleyan College) _____
 Other (specify): _____

26. Can you recall when and why you first contributed to IAD? No ____;
 Yes ____; if "Yes," what were the details as you recall them?

(2) (a) how many times have you contributed? ____ (Times)

(b) what has your contribution averaged? ____ (Average)

29. Do you read the IAD newsletter, "Homefront?" No ____; Yes ____;
 if "Yes," . . .

a) do you think it accurate?	No ____	Yes ____
b) do you think it intelligent?	No ____	Yes ____
c) do you think it useful?	No ____	Yes ____
d) do you think it shows any particular bias?	No ____	Yes ____
if "Yes," what is that bias: _____		

30. IAD and its members oppose "extremism." What does "extremism" mean to you?

31. In your opinion, the emphasis of IAD's anti-extremism is chiefly directed against . . .

the extreme right-wing _____
 the extreme left-wing _____
 black nationalists _____
 both left and right _____
 leftists, rightists, and black nationalists _____
 other: _____
 don't know _____

36. Would you object to a Communist joining IAD? No _____ Yes _____

a) Why? _____

40. Of all of your political activities and associations, how important to you is IAD?

Very important _____
 Moderately important _____
 Slightly important _____
 Unimportant _____

41. Do you feel that you belong to the Institute for American Democracy?
 No _____; Yes _____

a) if "No, " do you feel that you belong to any political group (including party)? No _____; Yes _____; if "Yes, " which ones?

b) if "Yes, " do you have this sense of belonging with any other political group (including party)? No _____; Yes _____; if "Yes, " which ones?

It is necessary that some questions be asked regarding the sociological nature of those affiliated with IAD and participating in this survey. Such information, though somewhat personal, is necessary for meaningful statistical analysis with the opinion data already supplied. Please remember, all information is CONFIDENTIAL.

43. What is the population of your present place of residence? _____

a) In what state do you presently reside? _____

44. How old are you? _____ (years, age last birthday)

45. Please indicate your sex: Male _____ Female _____

46. Please indicate your present marital status: Single _____
 Married _____
 Widowed _____
 Divorced or _____
 Separated _____

47. Have you any children? No _____; Yes _____; if "Yes, " how many? _____

48. What is your religion? Protestant _____ and denomination _____
 Roman Catholic _____
 Jewish _____
 Other (specify): _____
 None _____

a) do you attend your church or synagogue. . . Regularly _____
 Occasionally _____
 Almost never _____

55. Please check last year of school completed: Some grammar school _____
 Grammar school grad. _____
 Some high school _____
 High School grad. _____
 Some college _____
 College grad. _____
 Some post-graduate _____
 Post-graduate grad. _____

a) if you attended "some college" or more, please indicate the school name and degrees earned:

56. Approximately what is your current annual income from all sources?

Above \$100,000 _____
 \$50,000 - 99,999 _____
 \$40,000 - 49,999 _____
 \$30,000 - 39,999 _____
 \$25,000 - 29,999 _____
 \$20,000 - 24,999 _____
 \$15,000 - 19,999 _____
 \$10,000 - 14,999 _____
 \$ 5,000 - 9,999 _____
 Below \$5,000 _____

a) over the past three years, would you say that your annual income has changed significantly? No _____; Yes _____; if "Yes," how has it changed--that is, how much has it changed and in what direction?

_____ % (percentage of change) _____ (direction)